

ROUTLEDGE REVIVALS

Herodicus the Crateteian

A Study in Anti-Platonic Tradition

Ingemar Düring



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Routledge Revivals

HERODICUS



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

HERODICUS

THE CRATETEAN

A STUDY IN ANTI-PLATONIC TRADITION

BY

IN GEMAR DÜRING



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

First published in 1941 by Wahlström & Widstrand

This edition first published in 2018 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 1941 by Taylor and Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

Disclaimer

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and welcomes correspondence from those they have been unable to contact.

A Library of Congress record exists under ISBN: 80025246

ISBN 13: 978-0-367-14395-4 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-429-03183-0 (ebk)

KUNGL. VITTERHETS HISTORIE OCH ANTIKVITETS
AKADEMIENS HANDLINGAR, DEL 51:2

HERODICUS

THE CRATETEAN

A STUDY IN ANTI-PLATONIC TRADITION

BY

INGEMAR DÜRING



STOCKHOLM 1941
WAHLSTRÖM & WIDSTRAND
(i kommission)

KUNGL. VITTERHETS HISTORIE OCH
ANTIKNITETS AKADEMIENS HAND-
LINGAR UTGIVAS MED ANSLAG UR
HUMANISTISKA FONDEN

GÖTEBORG 1941
E. LANDERS BOKTRYCKERI AKTIEBOLAG

CONTENTS

	Page
I. An Epigram	5
II. The Essay <i>Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην</i>	12
A. Introduction	12
B. Text	18
1. <i>Οἱ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας στρατηγοί</i>	18
2. De anachronismis	20
3. De similitate, quae inter Platonem et Xenophontem intercessit ...	24
4. Philosophi maledicentiores quam comici sunt	27
5. De scriptis et discipulis Platonis	36
C. Commentary	41
1. The Soldiership of Socrates	41
2. Anachronisms	46
3. The Pretended Jealousy between Plato and Xenophon	54
4. The Calumny of the Philosophers	63
5. On Plato's Writings and Disciples	81
III. The Treatise <i>Περὶ Συμποσίων</i>	90
A. Introduction	90
B. Text	106
IV. The <i>Κωμωδούμενοι</i> and the other writings	125
V. The Anti-Platonic Tradition	132
1. Introduction	132
2. The Comedy.....	137
3. The Isocrateans and Other Contemporaries	143
4. Politics. Demochares	147
5. The Epicureans	151
6. Peripatetic Biography	153
7. Conclusions	155
8. Herodicus and his Followers.....	157
9. Lucian and Aristides	161
10. The Christian Fathers	163
11. Conclusion	171



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

I. AN EPIGRAM

On September 29th 146 B. C.¹ Ptolemy VII seizes the reins of the government in Alexandria after his brother Philometor, who had suddenly been killed by accident in Syria. He named himself Euergetes, but his loyal subjects called him Cacergetes or Physcon. For more than twenty years he had aspired to the throne and at several times had approached his goal within a hair's breadth. Philometor had had his brother's life in his hands at least twice, but spared him. Euergetes on the contrary shows no forbearance. The legitimate heir of the throne, Eupator, is made away with. Aristarchus, the famous teacher of the young prince, and with him all the more prominent learned men of the Museum, fled terror-stricken. An officer of the Guard, Cydas, was appointed President of the Royal Academy of Alexandria.

This diaspora can only be compared with the flight from Constantinople during the first half of the XV century. Not without grim humour the renaissance of art and letters in the world outside Alexandria, caused by this flight, is depicted by Andron:² Ἀλεξανδρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ παιδεύσαντες πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους, ἐκλειπούσης ἤδη τῆς ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας διὰ τὰς γενομένας συνεχεῖς κινήσεις ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τοὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου διαδόχους χρόνοις. ἐγένετο οὖν ἀνανέωσις πάλιν παιδείας ἀπάσης κατὰ τὸν ἑβδομον βασιλεύσαντα Αἰγύπτου Πτολεμαῖον, τὸν κυρίως ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων καλούμενον Κακεργέτην. οὗτος γὰρ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀποσφάξας οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ καὶ φυγαδεύσας τῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐφηβησάντων, ἐποίησε πλήρεις τὰς τε νήσους καὶ πόλεις ἀνδρῶν γραμματικῶν φιλοσόφων γεωμετρῶν μουσικῶν ζωγράφων παιδοτριβῶν τε καὶ ἱατρῶν καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν τεχνιτῶν,

¹ Recalculated according to the Julian calendar from the Ptolemaic Table of Kings, see Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, p. 305.

² ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς, *FHG* II 352, *FrGrHist* 246 Fr. He lived in the first century B. C. and adduces an eye-witness, Menecles from Alexandria.

οἱ διὰ τὸ πένεσθαι διδάσκοντες ἃ ἥπισταντο πολλοὺς κατεσκεύασαν ἄνδρας ἐλλογίμους.¹

The brutality of Physcon was severely upbraided throughout the world.² But in Pergamon only malignant delight was felt at the sufferings of the learned competitors. With triumphant scorn, Herodicus the Crateteian writes the following epigram.³

Φεύγετ', Ἀριστάρχειοι, ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης
Ἑλλάδα, τῆς ξουθῆς δειλότεροι κεμάδος,
γωνιοβόμβυκες, μονοσύλλαβοι, οἷσι μέμηλε
τὸ σφιν καὶ σφῶν καὶ τὸ μὴν ἦδὲ τὸ νῖν.
τοῦθ' ὅμιν εἴη δυσπέμφελον. Ἡροδίκῳ δὲ
Ἑλλὰς ἀεὶ μίμνοι καὶ θεόπαις Βαβυλῶν.

1 θαλάττης A
superscr. on C

4 καὶ τὸ σφῶν Pierson

5 δυσπέμφελον A δυσπέμφελοι

This epigram is so instructive that it may be taken as a starting-point in drawing the background for the person and activity of Herodicus.

Herodicus names himself a Babylonian. This means that he was from Seleucia like Diogenes ὁ Βαβυλώνιος,⁴ and he hopes that, in contradistinction to the Aristarcheans, he will be allowed to stay in Hellas.⁵ The language is, just as in the Aspasia poem quoted below, highly homerizing.

¹ Cfr Iust. XXXVIII 8,3. Aristarchus died on Cyprus, his most prominent disciple Apollodorus, the author of the *Χρονικά*, settled in Athens, another disciple, Dionysius Thrax, withdrew to Rhodes. When Physcon had spent his fury and matters were becoming more quiet, another disciple of Aristarchus of the name of Ammonius succeeded Cydas as President of the Museum. See Ed. Schwartz, *Ges. Schr.* I, 1938, p. 90 ff.

² Diod. XXXIII, in fine.

³ Ath. 222 A.

⁴ Strabo XVI 1,16 p. 743. Πάλαι μὲν οὖν ἡ Βαβυλῶν ἦν μητρόπολις τῆς Ἀσσυρίας, νῦν δὲ Σελεύκεια, ἡ ἐπὶ τῷ Τύγρει καλουμένη . . . ὥσπερ δὲ Βαβυλωνίαν τὴν χώραν καλοῦμεν, οὕτω καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐκεῖθεν Βαβυλωνίους καλοῦμεν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Σελευκείας ἤττον, κἂν ἐκεῖθεν ᾧσι, καθάπερ Διογένη τὸν Στωικὸν φιλόσοφον. Diog. Laert. VI 81 καλούμενος δὲ Βαβυλώνιος διὰ τὴν γειτονίαν.

⁵ Th. Bergk, *Fünf Abh. zur Gesch. d. griech. Philosophie u. Astronomie*, Leipzig 1883, p. 169, suggests the reading Πέργαμ' ἀεὶ or Μαλλὸς ἀεὶ. The latter is at

ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης. If Herodicus really wrote *θαλάττης*, he must be supposed to have meant it as an allusion to the affected learning of grammarians who preferred the Attic forms. Yet this seems to me very uncertain. Much later, when Atticism was in its prime, rhetors and grammarians were commonly derided on account of this craze; there are several epigrams of this kind in the XIth book of the Anthology.

κεμάς, II. K 361.

οἷσι μέμηλε, a well-known Homeric expression.

δυσπέμφελος belongs to the learned glosses of Homer, the meaning of which was uncertain, as may be seen from Zenodotus' attempts at interpretation II 748. I suppose Herodicus used the word in the same sense as when Hesiodus *Op.* 618 speaks of *ναυτιλίῃ δυσπέμφελος*. He wishes the Aristarcheans »a stormy passage«.

The *βιβλιακοὶ χαρακίται Μουσέων ἐν τάλάρῳ* were ridiculed already by Timon *fr.* 60 W. (= 12 D.), and the Anthology is rich in epigrams of the same kind and in the same style. All of them, however, are later than that of Herodicus. Meleager says in his own epitaph VII 419 *ὃν θεόπαις ἠνδρωσε Τύρος*. There is a long series of epigrams directed against grammarians, rhetors and expressly against the Aristarcheans, mainly from the golden age of Atticism during the reign of Augustus and Tiberius. Thus Antipater begins XI 20 *φεύγεθ', ὅσοι λόκκας* (archaic for *χλαμύδες*) *ἢ λοφνίδας* (torches made of wine bark, Ath. 701 A) *ἢ καμασῆνας* (a special kind of fish) *ἄδετε, ποιητῶν φύλον ἀκανθολόγων*, and Philippus XI 347 *Χαίροιθ', οἱ περὶ κόσμον ἀεὶ πεπλανηκότες ὄμμα οἷ τ' ἀπ' Ἀριστάρχου σῆτες* (bookworms) *ἀκανθολόγοι*. The epigram XI 322 by Antiphanes is worth quoting.

*Γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζώρυχα Μούσης
ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,
τῶν μεγάλων κηλίδες, ἐπ' Ἡρόνῃ δὲ κομῶντες*

any rate a rather adventurous conjecture and the former not very plausible. *Ἑλλάς* both in verse 2 and 6 must be understood in a wider sense than the pure geographical one, as in the famous words of Isocr. *Panegy.* 50. Eustathius comments, 1077, 25, *Ἡρόδικος δὲ ὁ Βαβυλώνιος εὐξάμενος τὸ Ἡροδίκῳ, τοντέστιν ἐμοί, Ἑλλάς ἀεὶ μίμνοι καὶ θεόπαις Βαβυλών, ἄδηλον περὶ ποίας Ἑλλάδος ποιεῖται τὴν εὐχὴν*.

πικροὶ καὶ ξηροὶ Καλλιμάχου πρόκυνες,
ποιητῶν λῶβαι, παισὶ σκότος ἀρχομένοισιν,
ἔρροιτ', εὐφώνων λαθροδάκναι κόριες.

A certain style has already developed. Compare the following epigram by Philippus, XI 321:

Γραμματικοὶ Μῶμον Στυγίου τέκνα, σῆτες ἀκανθῶν,
τελχῖνες βίβλων, Ζηνοδότου σκύλακες,
Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται, ὃν ὥς ὄπλον ἐκτανύσαντες
οὐδ' αὐτοῦ κείνου γλῶσσαν ἀποστρέφετε,
συνδέσμων λυγρῶν θηρήτορες, οἷς τὸ μὴν ἢ σφὶν
εὐαδε, καὶ ζητεῖν εἰ κύνας εἶχε Κύκλωψ,
τρίβοισθ' εἰς αἰῶνα κατατρύζοντες ἀλιτροὶ
ἄλλων, ἔς δ' ἡμᾶς ἰὸν ἀποσβέσατε.

Typical features are easily recognized. Another example offers Lucillus Tarrhaeus, XI 140.¹

Τούτοις τοῖς παρὰ δεῖπνον ἀοιδομάχοις λογολέσχαις,
τοῖς ἀπ' Ἀριστάρχου γραμματολικριφίσιν,
οἷς οὐ σκῶμμα λέγειν, οὐ πεῖν φίλον, ἀλλ' ἀνάκεινται
νηπυτιενόμενοι Νέστορι καὶ Πριάμῳ,
μή με βάλλης κατὰ λέξιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι.
Σήμερον οὐ δειπνῶ μῆνιν ἄεθεθά.

Also in Latin literature there is a short poem of the same kind still extant, Virgil's *Catalept.* II b.²

Corinthiorum amator iste verborum
iste iste rhetor amputatus et totus

¹ See the interesting study by A. Linnenkugel, *De Lucillo Tarrhaeo*, D. München, Rhet. Stud. hrsg. v. E. Drerup, Heft XIII, Paderborn 1926, p. 50—51. οὐ πεῖν (the vulgar form, as ταμεῖον ὑγείς) φίλον is the negative equivalence of οἷς τὸ μὴν ἢ σφὶν εὐαδε. See also Aristoph. *Ran.* 93 and Kock's commentary.

² Commented on by Th. Birt, *Jugendverse u. Heimatpoesie Vergils*, Leipzig 1910, p. 52, where the old literature is recorded. It should be borne in mind that Horace has also imitated this Alexandrian style *Ep.* III 19, 18, although, in a curious way, he has reversed the order: *forum putealque Libonis* (= the tribunal of the praetor) *mandabo siccis* (cfr XI 31 ὑδροπόται who, according to XI 20, κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ) *adimam cantare severis* (XI 322 πικροὶ καὶ ξηροί).

*Thucydides renatus, Attice febris,
Tau Gallicum, min et spin ut male illisit,
ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.*

Herodicus the Cratetean¹ belonged to the Pergamene school of grammar. It is very probable that all these abusive words directed against the *γραμματικοί* by later epigrammatists originate in the polemic of the Pergamenes, which on the other hand can be derived from Stoic conceptions of *γραμματική*. The principal point of difference between the Pergamene and the Alexandrian school is thus defined by Sextus Empiricus:² the object of grammatical investigation according to Stoic doctrine was not in the first place the forms of the words but their sense and import. The grammarian is the servant of the critic — thus Crates haughtily overstated his standpoint.

The Cratetean school of grammar differed from the Aristarchean mainly in three respects. Following up the old Stoic doctrine, Crates based grammar on the system of anomaly³ instead of analogy. When he cannot understand a word or a phrase, he is quick to conjecture something else, as for instance when Φ 282 instead of the contested *ἐρχθέντα* he substitutes *εἰλθέντα*, a very rare word indeed. Further he adopted, probably here too influenced by Chrysippus, and developed to its extreme consequences, the old Greek idea⁴ that Homer

¹ ὁ Κρατήτειος Ath. 219 C, 234 D.

² Adv. Gramm. I 78 οὐδ' ἦπερ οἱ Στωικοὶ τὸ σημανόμενον ἀλλ' ἀνάπαλιν τὸ σημαῖνον. τὸ γὰρ νοητὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ σημανομένου μόνου παρείληπται. εἴκοι δὲ καὶ Κρατήτειόν τινα κινεῖν λόγον (sc. the author Chares, who is quoted here). καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγε διαφέρειν τὸν κριτικὸν τοῦ γραμματικοῦ, καὶ τὸν μὲν κριτικὸν πάσης φησι δεῖ λογικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἔμπειρον εἶναι, τὸν δὲ γραμματικὸν ἀπλῶς γλωσσῶν ἐξηγητικὸν καὶ προσφθίας ἀποδοτικὸν καὶ τῶν τούτοις παραπλησίων εἰδήμονα, παρ' ὃ καὶ εἰκέναι ἐκεῖνον μὲν ἀρχιτέκτονι, τὸν δὲ γραμματικὸν ὑπὴρέτη.

³ Diog. Laert. VII 192, Varro de l. l. 17, p. 121, Gell. II 25.

⁴ Isocr. Panegy. 159 οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν μείζω λαβεῖν δόξαν, ὅτι καλῶς τοὺς πολεμήσαντας τοῖς βαρβάρους ἐνεκωμίασε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο βουλευθῆναι τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν ἐντιμον αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι τὴν τέχνην ἐν τε τοῖς τῆς μουσικῆς ἄθλοις καὶ τῇ παιδείᾳ τῶν νεωτέρων, ἵνα πολλάκις ἀκούοντες τῶν ἐπῶν ἐκμανθάνωμεν τὴν ἐχθρὰν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ζηλοῦντες τὰς ἀρετὰς τῶν στρατευσαμένων τῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων ἐκείνοις ἐπιθυμῶμεν. Lycurg. c. Leocr. 102 stresses that Homer is our διδάσκαλος, but still it is mostly ἀρετῶν. When the conception of the Cratetean school had broken through, it sounds like this, Strab. III 4,4 οὐ δὲ θαυμάζοι τις

was the original source of all knowledge, be it astronomy or mathematics, medicine, geography, nay, the Chaldean language, whilst in this respect Aristarchus maintained the opinion of Eratosthenes and Zenodotus. In the treatise *On convivial customs*, ascribed to Heroicus, the repeated διδάσκει "Ομηρος is a sure sign of Pergamene origin. Lastly Crates applied an allegoric-symbolic interpretation of Homer, which made it possible for him to build up a whole cosmographic system, based on his exegesis of the poet.¹ Here he took up the ideas of Anaxagoras and Metrodorus.² The school of Crates never attained the firmness and solidity of the Aristarchean school, owing to the simple fact that the Pergamenes really had no respect for the preserved text and a literal interpretation, but gave free course to their various whims and caprices. In our collection of the scholia, which is mainly based on the Aristarchean corpus, there are not a few traces of the critical exegesis of Crates, and Mette's great collection of passages from scholia and different authors referring to the theory of the heavenly spheres, Σφαιροποιῖα, shows how deeply impressed later commentators were by the cosmographic interpretation of the Pergamenes, who radically abandoned the old Aristarchean principle "Ομηρον ἐξ "Ομήρου σαφηνίζειν.³ Both Didymus and especially Seleucus⁴ are thus influenced by the Pergamene comparative method, according to which other ancient poets were used to interpret Homer, a sound principle curiously enough condemned by the Aristarcheans.

The two schools wrote polemic pamphlets against one another.

ἂν οὔτε τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ὀδυσσεῶς πλάνην μυθογραφήσαντος τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον . . . (οὐκ ἀπίθανον ἐποίει τὸ πλάσμα), οὐτ' εἴ τινας αὐταῖς τε ταύταις ταῖς ἱστορίαις πιστεύσαντες καὶ τῇ πολυμαθείᾳ τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ πρὸς ἐπιστημονικῶς ὑποθέσεις ἐτρεψαν τὴν Ὀμήρουποίησιν, καθάπερ Κράτης τε ὁ Μαλλώτης ἐποίησε καὶ ἄλλοι τινές.

¹ H. J. Mette, *Sphairopoiia*, Unters. z. Kosmologie des Krates von Pergamon, München 1936. C. F. Wegener's book, *De aula Attalica*, Copenhagen 1836, is of course now obsolete but contains much good material, Wachsmuth's and Helck's writings on Crates still more. In spite of all these works, a comprehensive, readable study of the Crateteian school of grammar including its revival under Seleucus is, however, much to be desired.

² Diog. Laert. II 11, cfr Tatian. *ad Graec.* c. 21, Hesych. s. v. Ἀγαμέμνονα, *schol. ad II* 161, P 547, Sengebusch, *Diss. Hom.*, Leipzig 1861, I 133.

³ See the remarks by O. Müller, *Üb. d. Papyruskomm. z. Φ der Ilias*, D. München 1913, p. 44.

⁴ See Crates' *schol. Φ* 195, Wachsmuth, *Rhein. Mus.* 46 (1891), p. 554.

Thus Dionysius Thrax wrote *Πρὸς Κράτητα*¹ and Zenodotus the Crateteian from Mallos, who lived in Alexandria, wrote *Πρὸς τὰ ὑπ' Ἀριστάρχου ἀθετούμενα τοῦ ποιητοῦ*² and quite seriously declared that Homer was a Chaldean.³

During the reign of Tiberius the Crateteian school exercised its greatest influence, as is shown in a book by Ptolemy from Ascalon *Περὶ τῆς Κρατητείου αἰρέσεως* and the commentaries on Homer by Seleucus. Among well-known Crateteians are further to be counted the trusty Asclepiades of Myrlea (about 70 B. C.), Demetrius Ixion (in the time of Augustus), who had deserted the Aristarchean school, and the conceited Apion Pleistoneices (in the time of Tiberius).

The epigram quoted above shows us Herodicus as a fanatic Crateteian. As I interpret the introductory words »Flee, Aristarcheans . . .«, it must have been written some time after the 29th of September 146. If this were our only support for fixing the time when Herodicus lived, it would be at the most a *terminus post quem*. For, as a matter of fact, Lucillus, who must have been one of those *Graeculi esurientes*⁴ under Nero and Vespasianus, as we have seen, wrote epigrams against τοὺς ἀπ' Ἀριστάρχου γραμματολικρυφίδας and Philippus, who cannot at any rate be much older, scorns the *Καλλιμάχου στρατιώτας*. Furthermore the *φεύγεθ'* of Antipater, the *χαίροιθ'*, *ἔρροιτ'*, *τρίβοισθ'* of the other poets quoted, must be interpreted purely as an ornament of style, not literally. It must be stressed, however, that the epigram of Herodicus is the first known example of this kind; he should not be blamed, because certain expressions, which in his mouth are genuine and sincerely meant, afterwards became hackneyed commonplaces. Luckily there are, too, in the remainders of the essay *Πρὸς Φιλοσωκράτην* some data which help us to fix his life-time quite positively, namely the *σύνοδοι τῶν Διογενιστῶν Ἀντιπατριστῶν Πανατιαστῶν*, mentioned 186 A and discussed in the next chapter. These meetings were being celebrated in the year 145 and it is very likely that Herodicus who was then living in Athens, wrote his famous epigram, wishing himself Ἐλλὰς ἀεὶ μέμνοι in that year.

¹ Schol. I 464.

² Suidas s. v., Schneidewin, Philol. 2 (1847) p. 764.

³ Schol. Ψ 79 and A 591.

⁴ Juvenal. III 78.

II. THE ESSAY ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΦΙΛΟΣΩΦΙΚΑΤΗΝ.

Introduction.

In Athenaeus 215 F we read the following words: ὁ Πλάτων ἐπάγει καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ Δηλῷ γενομένην, μᾶλλον δὲ πεπλασμένην ἀνδραγαθίαν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ Δήλιον ἡγήκει Σωκράτης, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἡροδότος ὁ Κρατήτειος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην, ἅμα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀσχημόνως ἂν ἐφυγε. It is the merit of C. Schmidt¹ to have seen that the words ὡς ἱστορεῖ κτλ., which Casaubon could not understand, belong not to the protasis but to the whole sentence,² and that the anti-platonic calumnia in these chapters is taken from Herodicus and his pamphlet Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην.³

The question may however be raised, if we really have to do with a literary work in the emphatic sense of the word, that is to say a well-disposed collection of material, composed and discussed with a certain aim in view. Now, of course, »disposition» did not mean the same to the ancient Greeks as to us. It is a well-known fact that ancient literary works, some speeches of Isocrates excepted, are very badly disposed throughout. Perhaps the external form and internal composition of literary works were never so eagerly studied and treated as by the ancient Greeks, but in spite of all their bril-

¹ *De Herodico Crateteo* part. I, P. Elbing 1886. Although unfortunately Schmidt did not pursue his work, his paper of 13 pages contained so much evidence and sound learning that his results were at once generally accepted. All information in later handbooks, including the article by Gudeman in RE VIII 973 (1913), is based on Schmidt's excellent paper.

² Wegener too, who enumerates the writings of Herodicus, *De aula Attalica* p. 156, misunderstood these words: »Denique dissertationem quandam exaravit πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην in qua Socratem a calumniis adversariorum defendendum videtur suscepisse.

³ Diogenes Laertius called the lady, to whom he dedicated his work, Φιλοπλάτων. Atticus ap. Euseb. PE 795 C addressed οἱ φιλοπλάτωνες. Axionichus wrote a comedy under the title of Φιλευριπίδης.

liant theories the practical results were rather deficient. External, purely material conditions may have rendered a clear arrangement of the subject-matter difficult; the forms of publishing the works, *ἀνάγνωσις*, had the same effect. What though we lower our pretensions, yet even thus the remains of Herodicus' essay may hardly be said to form anything like a coherent work. It is probable that it consisted of loosely sketched miscellanies, a collection of articles inserted in his work *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα*. Athenaeus never saw the original work. I have tried to show below¹ that he possibly found these excerpts in the *Παντοδαπή ἱστορία* of Phavorinus, and to what extent the latter in his turn excerpted earlier works of the same kind, for instance Didymus, can only be guessed at, never proved. The consequence is that we must be very cautious in our conclusions. When I call Herodicus' *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην* an 'essay' or a 'work', I do so with the reservation that this is a convenient way of keeping together these scattered remnants.

What they have in common is the harsh anti-platonic tendency. The animosity against Plato has its root in the Homerolatry of the Pergamene school of grammar, but there are no traces of it in the fragments left of Crates' work.² The doctrine of the school taught that Homer was the source of all knowledge, and as Plato had expelled Homer from his Ideal State — Herodicus stresses this twice and after him Heraclitus in the *Ὀμηρικὰ Προβλήματα* — he had, in the eyes of a fanatic disciple of the school, committed an unpardonable offence. It is not likely that Herodicus speaks on behalf of Crates, he is his partisan. In the same way Isocrates had his Cephisodorus, Aristotle his Chamaeleon, Epicurus his Colotes. As disciples and followers they admire, imitate and on the whole thoroughly misunderstand their masters, and they believe that they do their best in trying to out-herod Herod.

In my edition the miscellaneous fragments have been collected in the following five groups according to their contents. Whether this was the original order, is of course impossible to say.

¹ See commentary to p. 505 BC, p. 58.

² A slight influence from Antisthenes is traced by Helck, *De Cratetis studiis crit. quae ad Il. sp.*, D. Leipzig 1905, p. 39, but it is not at all likely that the anti-platonic tendency has come in that way.

- A. *οἱ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας στρατηγοί.*
- B. The anachronisms in the writings of Plato.
- C. The alleged jealousy of Plato and Xenophon. Here I have sub-joined the chapter on Chaerephon.
- D. The calumnia and malignity of the Socratic philosophers. This section may originally have been arranged in this way:
 - a) 220 A—B (ch. V 62) *πεφύκασι*, on Aeschines.
 - b) 220 C—D (ch. V 63) *Ἀντισθένης δὲ — ἐξέδωκε κατ' αὐτοῦ.*
 - c) 219 B—220 A *Ἀλλὰ μὲν* (ch. V 61) with the apocryphic Aspasia-poem.
 - d) 220 EF *τούτοις γὰρ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν.*
 - e) 505 C—506 A (ch. XI 112—113) *Διαβάλλει δὲ ὁ Πλάτων.*
 - f) 506 A—507 A (ch. XI 114—115) Hegesander's *Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνος κακοηθείας.*

In my edition I have not, however, altered the order of the text in Athenaeus too much.

- E. On the writings of Plato, 507 E—508 E, his disciples, 508 E—509 E, and as an exodium the ecloga from Ephippus.

Apart from two small extracts from Aelius Aristides, which in some way or other must be drawn upon Herodicus' treatment of the anachronisms and consequently have been inserted in part B, the whole text is preserved by Athenaeus.

The treatise of Herodicus must on the whole be regarded as an original work. With his hatred towards Plato and the Academy to lead and inspire him he has collected his material and recomposed it carefully, so that it should suit his purpose. The commentary below shows in detail, how he has gone to work in straining the wording of his sources so as to suit his purpose. In most cases he quotes his sources, being a good imitator of the Alexandrian biographers.

First and foremost he has taken his matter from the writings of the philosophers themselves. He quotes a long series of works — known and unknown — by Plato and Xenophon but also by Antisthenes and Aeschines. Speusippus and Aristotle have each contributed one quotation.¹ There is also a quotation from Thucydides.

¹ 505 B and 506 A a passage from Aristotle's *Περὶ Ποιητῶν* is quoted after Nicias of Nicaea, but this quotation has been added afterwards, probably by Phavorinus.

Further, Herodicus has drawn material from the comedy, and the conjecture may be ventured that the study of the comedy has led him up to this new subject. It is true that there are not many direct quotations from the comedy in this essay, but still Aristophanes, Pherecrates, Eupolis and Ephippus are represented, and the anecdotic slander typical of the old comedy is spread all over the work. It must not be forgotten that the *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*, consisting of at least six books, was the principal work of Herodicus. Among contemporary notorious antagonists of Plato Isocrates, Theopompus and Dioscurides are mentioned. It is also likely that the polemic pamphlets of the Epicurean school have served as a source; there are some points of contact between Herodicus' treatise and the polemic pamphlet by Colotes, preserved by Plutarch, especially the chapter on Chaerephon and the nature of Socrates' wisdom.

One of Herodicus' chief sources was the famous speech of Demochares *Πρὸς Φίλωνα* in spring 306. The name of Demochares occurs twice in this essay and once in the treatise on convivial customs.

The peripatetic slander literature has, of course, been well-known to Herodicus. This is confirmed by many passages that remind one of Diogenes Laertius; numerous parallels are cited in the testimonia. Of these authors Herodicus himself mentions Timon, Hermippus, Carystius, Dicaeocles and Hegesander.

Finally the diction is enlivened by a sprinkling of poetical quotations from Homer, Stesichorus, Aesopus and by some proverbs. In the treatise on convivial customs are added some quotations from Sappho, Pindar and Bacchylides.

These quotations bear witness that Herodicus was a man of considerable reading and literary knowledge, and this is not to be wondered at in a coryphaeus of the Pergamene school.¹ But what use did he not make of his learning? The quotations are carefully selected, remodelled and interpreted in such a manner as to suit the purpose of the author — well, this has been the habit of controversialists at all times. And yet the extensive use that is made from the method here is astounding, especially as he deals with very important writers, of whom one would believe that they were well-known to the contemporary educated public. Thus two questions arise

¹ The *Πίνακες Περὶ γαμῶν* (*catalogi classicorum scriptorum*, says Wolf *Prolegom.* 278) are quoted by Dionys. Hal. *de Din.* 661, p. 317 Us.-R., cfr 630, p. 297.

concerning himself and his public: is it really possible that Herodicus himself believed in his own allegations, and secondly, what did the average educated man of his time think of his work?

Is it possible that he could in honest truth go so far in misinterpreting his sources? I believe the answer to this question must be an unqualified yes. There are good parallels from other ages. The Christian Fathers interpreted the noblest thoughts and utterances of the great ancient philosophers in a similar unscrupulous way, certainly from a firm conviction and in the most pious spirit. We may remember the polemic of the Epicureans against all contemporary schools; we can still read how a prominent, competent and judicious historian and critic, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in exhaustive writings, without the slightest tremor in his voice, expounds the thesis that it would have been better if Thucydides had not written his totally worthless treatise on the Peloponnesian war.¹ And how was dear old Sappho treated quite recently by Pierre Louys?² We have certainly no right to boast of our contemporary practice in this respect. We have all of us seen how prominent men of a high intellectual standard, blinded by political or religious bias or misled by their preconceived opinions, distort and misrepresent well-known facts and motives: we must keep this in mind, if we are fully to understand,³ how to regard a view of Plato such as the one Herodicus sets forth here. Herodicus is a fanatic, filled with intense hatred against Plato and philosophers in general, but he has almost certainly no conscious intention of deceiving either himself or his reader.⁴

¹ *Ep. ad Pomp.* 768 ὁ δὲ Θουκυδίδης πόλεμον ἔνα γράφει, καὶ τοῦτον οὔτε καλὸν οὔτε εὐτυχῆ· ὃς μάλιστα μὲν ὤφειλε μὴ γενέσθαι, εἰ δὲ μή, σιωπῇ καὶ λήθῃ παραδοθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιγιγνομένων ἡγνοῆσθαι. In all times tall talk fits well to petty and paltry thoughts.

² See Wilamowitz in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1896, p. 623 = *Sappho u. Simonides* p. 63.

³ »Die probe auf solch ein literarisches exempel, wie es die fixierung eines zeitlos und autorlos überlieferten buches oder eines inhaltlosen schriftstellernamens ist, scheint mir überhaupt darin zu liegen, dass man erkennt, wie die ermittelten merkmale des fraglichen buches, tendenz und manier, sich in der zeit ausnehmen in welche man es verweist.« Wilamowitz, *Antigonos v. Karystos*, *Phil. Unters.* IV (1881), p. 52.

⁴ Philosophical literature is rich in frauds, even Galenus knew that, ad *Hipp. de nat. hom.* I 42, XV 105 K. (I 44, p. 54 M., *CMG* V 9,1), Ammonius in *Aristot. Cat.* 10 (*Comment in Arist.* Gr. IV 4). Especially in the time of rivalry between

Herodicus' essay also presents the educational standard of the contemporary public in an unfavourable light. Still, let us not think too highly of our own time, even in this respect. Nevertheless we cannot be blind to the fact that Herodicus had a very low opinion of public education. This is, however, not so remarkable as it will seem at first. Even Isocrates remarks drily that the public does not attach great importance to accuracy with regard to facts, but is rather prone to look upon accuracy as *μικρολογία* and Aristotle¹ observes that accuracy and exactness mean nothing to, and moreover are not fit for, uneducated people. By listening to speeches in the courts of law the Athenians had become if not generally mendacious, at least absolutely unscrupulous. An amusing example of how deliberately chosen quotations were dealt with, is found in Aeschines' exposition of *φήμη*.² The ordinary educated Greek was certainly intellectually agile and ready-witted,³ but had at the same time a more definite liking for what was new and rare and dashing than for mere solid fact.⁴ There is a good portion of truth in the old word "*Ἕλληνες ἀεὶ παῖδες ἔστε*". If thus the educational standard in Athens at the apogee of its civilization must be considered rather low, what must have been the situation in the Hellenistic cities, when we see one of the learned members of the Pergamene Academy of Letters, even when the school was in its prime, handle truth so frivolously?

Pergamon and Alexandria, literary impostors were not rare. See Gudeman, *Literary Frauds among the Greeks*, Class. Studies in Honour of H. Drisler, New York 1894, p. 52—74.

¹ *Rhet. I* 1, 1355 b 24, *περὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐντεύξεως*, cfr *Top. I* 2 and Isocr. *Antidos.* 261.

² *In Timarch.* 140—141. Even Homer was not easily understood, as is shown by Aristophanes' *Δαιταλῆς*, Straton III 361 Kock, Athen. 382 F, Wilcken Ber. Ak. Berlin 1887, p. 818.

³ Dem. *Ol. III* 32 (III 15 West.) *γνῶναι πάντων ὑμεῖς δξύντατοι τὰ ῥηθέντα*.

⁴ Antiph. II 22 Kock *ἐν καινὸν ἐγγέλρημα, κἂν τολμηρὸν ἦ, πολλῶν παλαιῶν ἐστι χρησιμώτερον* and Plut. *praec. rei publ. ger.* 799 C *μᾶλλον δξέως ὑπονοεῖν ἢ διδάσκεισθαι καθ' ἡσυχίαν βουλόμενοι*. And how is it nowadays?

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΦΙΛΟΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΝ

1. Οἱ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας στρατηγοί. ATHENAEVS V 55, 215 C—216 C.

V 55, 215 C Τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας στρατηγοί, περὶ ὧν Δ η μ ο χ ᾱ ρ η ς
ἔλεγεν ὥσπερ ἐκ θύμβρας οὐδεὶς ἂν δύναιτο κατασκευάσαι λόγχην, οὐδ' ἐκ
Σωκράτους στρατιώτην ἄμεμπτον.' ὁ γὰρ Πλάτων φησὶν τρεῖς στρατείας 3
D στρατεύσασθαι Σωκράτη, τὴν μὲν εἰς Ποτίδαιαν, τὴν δὲ εἰς Ἀμφίπολιν,
τὴν δὲ εἰς Βοιωτοὺς ὅτε καὶ συνέβη τὴν ἐπὶ Δηλῷ μάχην γενέσθαι. μηδε-
νὸς δὲ τοῦθ' ἱστορηκότος αὐτὸς καὶ ἀριστείων φησὶν αὐτὸν τετυχηκέναι, 6
πάντων Ἀθηναίων φυγόντων, πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ἀπολομένων. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα
ἔψευδολόγηται. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἀμφίπολιν στρατεία γέγονεν ἐπὶ Ἀλκαίου
ἄρχοντος Κλέωνος ἡγούμενου ἐξ ἐπιλέκτων ἀνδρῶν, ὥς φησι Θ ο υ κ ν δ ῖ - 9
δ η ς. τούτων οὖν τῶν ἐπιλέκτων ἀνάγκη εἶναι καὶ Σωκράτην, ὃ πλὴν
E τριβώνος καὶ βακτηρίας οὐδὲν ἦν. τίς οὖν εἶπεν ἱστοριογράφος ἢ ποιητής;
ἢ ποῦ Θουκυδίδης τὸν Σωκράτη παρενέχρωσε τὸν Πλάτωνος στρατιώτην; 12
'τί γὰρ ἀσπίδι ξύνθημα καὶ βακτηρία;'
Πότε δὲ καὶ εἰς Ποτίδαιαν ἐστρατεύσατο, ὥς ἐν τῷ Χαρμίδῃ εἶρηκεν ὁ
Πλάτων φάσκων αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν ἀριστείων τότε Ἀλκιβιάδῃ παραχωρῆσαι; 15
τοῦτο οὐτε Θουκυδίδου ἀλλ' οὐδ' Ἰσοκράτους εἰρηκότος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ
ζεύγους. ποίας δὲ καὶ μάχης γενομένης ἔλαβε τὰ ἀριστεῖα Σωκράτης καὶ
τί πράξας ἐπιφανὲς καὶ διάσημον; καθόλου μάχης μηδεμιᾶς συμπεσούσης, 18
F ὡς ἱστόρηκε Θουκυδίδης.

1 Demochares *fr.* 3 Baiter-Sauppe

3 Πλάτων] *Apol.* 28 B, *Charm.* 153 B

Symp. 220 E, *Diog. L.* II 22.

9 Θουκυδίδης] V 2, 1 Ἀθηναίων μὲν ὀπλίτας

ἔχων, *cfr de expeditione Phormionis Isocr. Περὶ ζεύγους* 12 ἐπιλεξάμενος τοὺς ἀρίστους

14 Ποτίδαιαν] *Charm.* 153 B, *cfr Plut. Alc.* c. 7, *Ael. Var. Hist.* III 17, *Greg.*

Naz. contra Iul. I, *PGM* 35, 596 B.

1 δημοχάρης κράτης A δημόχαριν C : corr. Ruhnken, *cfr Ath.* 187 D 6

ἱστορηκότος ἕτερον (s. ἑτέρου) C 7 τῶν ante Ἀθηναίων add. G, *sed uide Diog.*

L. II 23, *Plut. Alc.* 195 A

12 παρενεχώρησε Madvig παρενέκρουσε Kaibel

praeef. III, p. VI

13 τί — βακτηρία comici poetae versus olent

16 οὐδ' Dindorf : οὐτ' A

Οὐκ ἄρκεσθεις δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ τερατολογίᾳ ὁ Πλάτων ἐπάγει καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ 215 F
 Δηλῶ γενομένην, μᾶλλον δὲ πεπλασμένην ἀνδραγαθίαν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ
 3 Δῆλιον ἡγήκει Σωκράτης, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἡρόδικος ὁ Κρατήτειος ἐν
 τοῖς πρὸς τὸν Φίλοσωκράτην, ἅμα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀσχημόνως ἂν ἔφυγε, Πα-
 γώνδου δύο τέλη περιπέμπαντος τῶν ἱππέων ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς περὶ τὸν λόφον.
 6 τότε γὰρ οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὸ Δῆλιον τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔφυγον, οἱ δ' ἐπὶ θάλατταν, 216
 ἄλλοι δὲ ἐπὶ Ὠρωπόν, οἱ δὲ <πρὸς> Πάρνηθα τὸ ὄρος· Βοιωτοὶ δ' ἐφεπό-
 μενοι ἔκτεινον καὶ μάλιστα οἱ ἱππεῖς οἳ τε αὐτῶν καὶ <οἱ> Λοκρῶν. τοι-
 9 οὔτου οὖν κυδοιμοῦ καὶ φόβου καταλαβόντος τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, μόνος Σω-
 κράτης βρενθνόμενος καὶ τῷ φθαλμῷ παραβάλλων εἰστέλλει ἀναστέλλων τὸ
 Βοιωτῶν καὶ Λοκρῶν ἱππικόν· καὶ ταύτης τῆς ἀνδρείας αὐτοῦ οὐ Θουκυ-
 12 δίδης μέμνηται, οὐκ ἄλλος οὐδεὶς <οὔτε ἱστοριογράφος οὔτε> ποιητής.

Πῶς δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀριστείων Ἀλκιβιάδῃ παραχωρεῖ τῷ μῆδ' ὅλως κεκοινω- B
 νηκότι ταύτης τῆς στρατείας; ἐν δὲ τῷ Κρίτωνι ὁ τῇ Μνημοσύνῃ φίλος
 15 Πλάτων οὐδὲ ποιήσασθαι πώποτε ἀποδημίαν τὸν Σωκράτη ἔξω τῆς
 εἰς Ἰσθμὸν θεωρίας εἴρηκε. καὶ Ἀντισθένης δ' ὁ Σωκρατικός
 περὶ τῶν ἀριστείων τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι ἱστορεῖ. 'οὐκ ἐστὶν δ' ἔτυμος ὁ
 18 λόγος οὗτος'. χαρίζεται γὰρ καὶ ὁ κύων οὗτος πολλὰ τῷ Σωκράτει, ὅθεν
 οὐδετέρῳ αὐτῶν δεῖ πιστεύειν σκοπὸν ἔχοντας Θουκυδίδην. ὁ γὰρ Ἀντι-
 σθένης καὶ προσεπάγει τῇ ψευδογραφίᾳ λέγων οὕτως· 'ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀκούομεν C
 21 κὰν τῇ πρὸς Βοιωτοὺς μάχῃ τὰ ἀριστεῖά σε λαβεῖν. — εὐφῆμει, ὦ ξένε· Ἀλ-
 κιβιάδου τὸ γέρας, οὐκ ἐμόν. — σοῦ γε δόντος, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν.' ὁ δὲ
 Πλάτωνος Σωκράτης εἰς Ποτίδαιαν λέγει παρεῖναι καὶ τῶν ἀριστείων
 24 Ἀλκιβιάδῃ παρακεχωρηκέναι. προτερεῖ δὲ κατὰ πάντας τοὺς ἱστορικοὺς
 τῆς ἐπὶ Δῆλιον στρατείας ἢ περὶ Ποτίδαιαν, ἥς Φορμίων ἐστρατήγει.

2 πεπλασμένην] cfr Timon Sill. 52 Wachsmuth 4 Thucyd. IV 96,5
 Παγώνδου περιπέμπαντος δύο τέλη τῶν ἱππέων ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς περὶ τὸν λόφον, ὡς
 ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐώνυμον αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑπερφανέων αἰφνιδίως, τὸ νικῶν τῶν Ἀθηναίων
 κέρας, νομίσαν ἄλλο στράτευμα ἐπιέναι, ἐς φόβον καταστῆναι, καὶ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἤδη,
 ὑπὸ τε τοῦ τοιοῦτου καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Θηβαίων ἐφεπομένων καὶ παραρηγνόντων, φυγὴ
 καθεισθίηκει παντὸς τοῦ στρατοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. καὶ οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὸ Δῆλιόν τε καὶ
 τὴν θάλασσαν ὤρμησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ὠρωποῦ, ἄλλοι δὲ πρὸς Πάρνηθα τὸ ὄρος, οἱ
 δὲ ὡς ἑκαστοὶ τινα εἶχον ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας. Βοιωτοὶ δὲ ἐφεπόμενοι ἔκτεινον, καὶ
 μάλιστα οἱ ἱππεῖς οἳ τε αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Λοκροί. Cfr Plut. Alc. 194 F. 10 Aristoph.
 Nub. 362 apud Plat. Conv. 221 B 14 Κρίτωνι] 52 B 16 Αντισθένης]
 fr. 18,10 Winckelmann 17 Stesich. fr. 11 Diehl apud Plat. Phaedr. 243 A.

3 ἡγήκει A : corr. Porson 4 ἔφυγεν ἄγων δ' οὐ A : corr. Musurus, nisi
 quod ἔφυγε corr. Meineke 7 <πρὸς> e Thuc. 8 ὅτι ἐαυτῶν A :
 corr. e Thuc. <οἱ> e Thuc. 12 <οὔτε — οὔτε> addidi collato 215 F

2. De anachronismis. ATHENAEVS V 56—59, p. 216 C—218 E, Aelius Aristides *or. Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων* p. II 371 et II 370 Dindorf.

V 56, 216 C Πάντ' οὖν ψεύδονται οἱ φιλόσοφοι καὶ πολλὰ παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους γράφον-
 τες οὐκ αἰσθάνονται, καθάπερ οὐδ' ὁ καλὸς Ξενοφῶν, δς ἐν τῷ Συμπο-
 D σίῳ ὑποτίθεται Καλλίαν τὸν Ἱππονίκου Αὐτολύκου τοῦ Λύκωνος ἐρῶντα 3
 καὶ νενικηκότος αὐτοῦ παγκράτιον ἐστίασιν ποιούμενον, καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἄλ-
 λοις δαιτυμόσι παρόντα αὐτόν, ἴσως μὲν γενηθέντα ἢ περὶ τὴν παιδικὴν
 ἡλικίαν ὑπάρχοντα. ἐστὶν δὲ οὗτος ὁ καιρὸς καθ' ὃν Ἀριστίων ἀρχων ἦν. 6
 ἐπὶ τούτῳ γὰρ Εὐπολις τὸν Αὐτολύκον διδάξας διὰ Δημοστράτου χλευάζει
 E τὴν νίκην τοῦ Αὐτολύκου. Πάλιν ὁ Ξενοφῶν ποιεῖ τὸν Σωκράτην λέγοντα
 ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ ταυτί 'καίτοι Πανσανίας γε ὁ Ἀγάθωνος τοῦ ποιητοῦ 9
 ἐραστὴς ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀκρασίᾳ συγκαλινδουμένων εἴρηκεν ὡς
 καὶ στρατεύμα ἀλκιμώτατον ἂν γένοιτο ἐκ παιδικῶν καὶ ἐραστῶν. τούτους
 γὰρ ἂν ἔφη οἶεσθαι μάλιστα ἂν αἰδεῖσθαι ἀλλήλους ἀπολείπειν, θαυμαστά 12
 λέγων, εἴ γε οἱ φύγον τε ἀφροντιστεῖν καὶ ἀναισχυντεῖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους
 F ἐθιζόμενοι, οὗτοι μάλιστα αἰσχύνονται αἰσχρόν τι ποιεῖν.' ὅτι μὲν οὖν τού-
 των οὐδὲν εἴρηκεν Πανσανίας ἔξεστι μαθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ Πλάτωνος Συμποσίου. 15
 Πανσανίου γὰρ οὐκ οἶδα σύγγραμμα, οὐδ' εἰσῆκται παρ' ἄλλῳ λαλῶν οὗτος
 περὶ χρήσεως ἐραστῶν καὶ παιδικῶν ἢ παρὰ Πλάτωνι. πλὴν εἴτε κατέψευ-
 σται τοῦτο Ξενοφῶν εἴτ' ἄλλως γεγραμμένῳ τῷ Πλάτωνος ἐνέτυχε Συμπο- 18
 σίῳ, παρείσθω. τὸ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἀστόχημα λεκτέον. Ἀριστίων,
 217 ἐφ' οὗ τὸ συμπόσιον ὑπόκειται συνηγμένον, πρὸ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν Εὐφῆμον
 πρότερος ἦρξεν, καθ' ὃν Πλάτων τὰ Ἀγάθωνος νικητήρια γέγραπεν, ἐν οἷς 21

2 Ξενοφῶν] *Conu.* 1,2 Καλλίας δ' ὁ Ἱππονίκου ἐρῶν ἐτύγχανεν Αὐτολύκου παιδὸς
 ὄντος καὶ νενικηκότα αὐτόν παγκράτιον ἦκεν ἄγων ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν 8 *Xen.*
Conu. c. 8,32, cfr *Plat. Conu.* 178 E στρατόπεδον ἐραστῶν τε καὶ παιδικῶν, *uberius*
Hieronimus de hac re apud Athen. XIII 78 p. 602 A sqq. *Ael. Var. Hist.*
 III 9. De re cfr *Cyril.* VII 1,30, *Reip. Laced.* II 12, *Anab.* VII 4,7, *Athen.*
 561 F, *Strab.* X 4,21, *App. Hispan.* 84, *Caes. Bell. Gall.* III 22

2 αἰσχύνονται *Wilamowitz* 5 αὐτόν *scripsi*, (αὐτόν) τὸν *Casaubonus et*
Kaibel : τόν *codd.* 10 συγκαλινδουμένων *Xen.* 11 τε καὶ ἐραστῶν
Xen. 12 ἀπολείπειν *Xen.* 13 φύγον γε **A** τε *om.* **C**
 14 αἰσχύνονται *codd.*, *Xen.* : αἰσχυνοῦνται *Valckenaer* 19 λεκτέον: *fortasse*
δεικτέον Cobet 21 καθ' ἣν **A**: *corr.* *Musurus*

Πανσανίας τὰ περὶ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν διεξέρχεται. θαυμαστὸν οὖν καὶ τετρα- 217 A
τῶδες, εἰ τὰ μήπω ῥηθέντα, μετὰ δὲ τέτταρα ἔτη ἐπιχειρηθέντα παρ'
3 Ἀγάθωνι, Σωκράτης παρὰ Καλλία δειπνῶν εὐθύνει <ὥς> οὐ δεόντως
ῥηθέντα.

- "Ολως δὲ λῆρός ἐστι τῷ Πλάτωνα τὸ Συμπόσιον. ὅτε γὰρ Ἀγάθων ἐνίκα, V 57
6 Πλάτων ἦν δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Εὐφρήμον στεφανοῦ-
ται Αθηναίοις, Πλάτων δὲ γεννᾶται ἐπὶ Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ μετ' Εὐθύδημον
ἄρξαντος. δύο δὲ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα βιώσας ἔτη μετέλλαξεν ἐπὶ Θεοφίλου B
9 τοῦ μετὰ Καλλίμαχον, ὃς ἐστὶν ὀγδοηκοστὸς καὶ δεῦτερος. ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀπολ-
λοδώρου καὶ τῆς Πλάτωνος γενέσεως τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτος ἐστὶν ἄρχων
Εὐφρημος, ἐφ' οὗ τὰ ἐπινίκια Ἀγάθωνος ἐστιῶνται. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Π λ ά-
12 τ ω ν δηλοῖ τὴν συνουσίαν ταύτην πρὸ πολλοῦ γεγονέναι, λέγων οὕτως ἐν
τῷ Συμποσίῳ "... εἰ νεωστὶ ἡγεῖ τὴν συνουσίαν γεγονέναι, ὥστε καμὲ
παραγενέσθαι. ἐγὼ γάρ, ἔφη. πόθεν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὦ Γλαύκων; οὐκ οἶσθ' C
15 ὅτι πολλῶν ἐτῶν Ἀγάθων οὐκ ἐπιδεδήμηκε;" καὶ προελθὼν φησιν. "ἀλλ'
εἰπέ μοι, πότε ἐγένετο ἡ συνουσία αὕτη; καὶ γὰρ εἶπον ὅτι παίδων ἔτι ὄντων
ἡμῶν, ὅτε τῇ τραγωδίᾳ ἐνίκησεν ὁ Ἀγάθων."
18 Ἐν γὰρ τῷ Συμποσίῳ συνάγει μὲν εἰς ταῦτόν Ἀριστοφάνη καὶ Σωκράτη Ael. Arist.
καὶ Ἀγάθωνα, ἔτι μειράκιον ὄντα, ὥς φησι. προάγει δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον τοὺς II 371
χρόνους, ὥστε λέγων ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης, ἐπειδὴ τῆς λυγρὸς ἐπαύσατο, τὸν
21 προβληθέντα λόγον, μέμνηται καὶ οὗτος αὖ πάλιν Ἀρκάδων ὑπὸ Λακεδαι-
μονίων διωκισμένων. διωκίσθησαν δὲ Μαντινεῖς ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἥδη
τῆς εἰρήνης ὁμωμοσμένης. οὕτως ἐστὶ ταῦτ' ἐκείνων ἔτι νεώτερα. πῶς
24 οὖν ἡ Ἀριστοφάνης ἂν εἴη λέγων ταῦτα ἡ Σωκράτης ἀκούων ἡ Ἀγάθων
ἔτι μειράκιον περὶ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους; πῶς δ' ἂν καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης κωμάζοι
παρ' αὐτούς, καὶ οὗτος νέος τε ὢν ἔτι καὶ καλός, ὃς πρότερος τοῦ Σωκρά-
27 τος ἐτεθνήκει βιούς τόσα καὶ τόσα ἔτη τὰ σύμπαντα; εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἐν τῷ
Ἡλυσίῳ πεδίῳ τὸ συμπόσιον συνεκροτεῖτο. τίς δὲ καὶ ἡ λύγξ ἡ τοῦ Ἀρι-
στοφάνους; καὶ ποῦ σὺ τοῦτ' ἐτήρησας; ἀλλ' οἶμαι λύζειν αὐτὸν ἔδει, ἵνα
30 εἰς ἀπλησίαν σκωφθῇ. εἰ δέ τις τῇ Πλάτωνος δόξῃ περὶ πάντων ἰσχυρί-
ζοιτο, καὶ φάσκοι μὲν ζῆν Σωκράτη, ὅτε ὁ τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ καὶ Λεχαίῳ
τετελευτηκότων ἐλέγετο ἐπιτάφιός, πίνειν δ' ἐν Ἀγάθωνος μετὰ τὴν εἰρήνην,

11 Πλάτων] Conv. 172 C

15 προελθὼν] Conv. 173 A

3 <ὥς> add. Kaibel
ἦν ἐρωτᾷς, ὥστε Plato9 ἀπὸ Musurus: ἐπὶ A
14 ἔγωγ' ἔφη Plat. ἔφην A13 γεγονέναι ταύτην
ὦ Λύκων A15 Ἀγάθων ἐνθάδε οὐκ Plato
16 ὄντων ἡμῶν ἔτι Platoπροσελθὼν A : corr. Musurus
17 τῇ πρώτῃ τραγωδίᾳ Plato

- λύζειν δ' Ἀριστοφάνη ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, κωμάζειν δ' Ἀλκιβιάδην, μειράκια
 δ' εἶναι τηρικαῦτα Ἀγάθωνα καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην, ὁμοῦ δ' εἶναι πάντα χρήματα,
 πῶς οὐχὶ ληρήσει, μὴ προσεξετάζων εἴ τι καὶ κατ' ἐξουσίαν ἀνὴρ λέγοι; 3
- 217 C Ὅτι δὲ πολλὰ ὁ Πλάτων παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἀμαρτάνει δῆλόν ἐστιν ἐκ
 πολλῶν. κατὰ γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα ποιητὴν ὅτι κεν ἐπ' ἀκαιρίμαν γλῶτταν
 ἔλθῃ, τοῦτο μὴ διακρίνας γράφει. οὐ γὰρ ἀκαίρως τι ἔλεγεν, ἀλλὰ πάνν 6
- V 58 .D ἔσκεμμένως, ὥς ἐν τῷ Γοργία γράφων φησίν· ἄθλιος ἄρα οὗτος ὁ Ἀρχέ-
 λαός ἐστι κατὰ τὸν σὸν λόγον. — εἴπερ γε, ὦ φίλε, ἄδικος'. εἴτα ῥητῶς
 εἰπὼν ὥς κατέχοντος τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴν Ἀρχελάου προβάς γράφει τάδε. 9
 'καὶ Περικλέα τοῦτον <τὸν> νεωστὶ τετελευτηκότα'. εἰ δὲ νεωστὶ τετε-
 λεύτηκε Περικλῆς, Ἀρχέλαος οὕτω κύριός ἐστι τῆς ἀρχῆς· εἰ δ' οὗτος
 βασιλεύει, πρὸ πολλοῦ πάνν χρόνον ἀπέθανε Περικλῆς. Περδίκκας τοί- 12
 νν πρὸ Ἀρχελάου βασιλεύει, ὥς μὲν ὁ Ἀκάνθιος φησι Νικομήδης, ἔτη
 E μ', Θεόπομπος δὲ λ', Ἀναξιμένης μ', Ἰερώνυμος κή', Μαρσύας δὲ καὶ
 Φιλόχορος κγ'. τούτων οὖν διαφόρως ἱστορουμένων λάβωμεν τὸν ἐλάχι- 15
 στον ἀριθμὸν τὰ κγ' ἔτη. Περικλῆς δ' ἀποθνήσκει κατὰ τὸ τρίτον ἔτος τοῦ
 Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου <ἐπὶ> ἄρχοντος Ἐπαμείνωνος, ἐφ' οὗ τελευτᾷ †
 Περδίκκας καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀρχέλαος διαδέχεται. πῶς οὖν 'νεωστὶ' κατὰ 18
 Πλάτωνα τελευτᾷ Περικλῆς;
- Ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ Γοργία ὁ Πλάτων τὸν Σωκράτη ποιεῖ λέγοντα· καὶ
 F πέρυσσι βουλεύειν λαχόν, ἐπειδὴ ἡ φυλὴ ἐπρυτάνευε καὶ ἔδει με ἐπυρηφίζειν, 21
 γέλωτα παρεῖχον καὶ οὐκ ἡδυνάμην ἐπυρηφίσαι. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ διαψηφι-

2 ὁμοῦ δ' εἶναι πάντα χρήματα Anaxagoras fr. 1 Diels. 5 ποιητὴν] fragm.
 mel. chor. adesp. 12 Diehl, ubi testimonia invenies 7 Gorg. 471 A
 9 τάδε] Gorg. 503 C 12 Περδίκκας] cfr Diod. Sic. XIV 37, Clinton-Krueger,
 Fasti Hellen. p. 238 20 Gorgias 473 E

6 ἀκαίρως Casaubonus : ἀγράφως codd. 10 <τὸν> add. e Platone
 εἰδέναι εἰ δὲ νεωστὶ A : corr. Musurus 17 <ἐπὶ> add. Schweighäuser collat.
 215 D, 217 A, D, 218 A, B, E 17 † hiatus not. Casaubonus cuius supple-
 menta dubia sunt 22 ἡδυνάμην] ἡπιστάμην Plato post ἐπυρηφίσαι
 haec leguntur: τοῦτο ὁ Σωκράτης οὐ κατὰ ἀδυναμίαν ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον
 κατὰ ἀνδραγαθίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἡβούλετο λύειν δημοκρατίας νόμους. παρίστησι δὲ τοῦτο
 σαφῶς ὁ Ξενοφῶν (Hellen. I 7, 14, cfr Mem. I 1, 18) ἐν πρώτῳ Ἑλληνικῶν ἐκτι-
 θεῖς οὕτως: 'τῶν δὲ πρυτάνεων τινῶν οὐ φασκόντων προθήσειν τὴν διαψήφισιν παρὰ
 τοὺς νόμους (τὸν νόμον Xen.), αὐθις Καλλίξιενος ἀναβάς κατηγορεῖ αὐτῶν. οἱ δὲ
 ἐβδὼν καλεῖν τοὺς οὐ φάσκοντας· οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις φοβηθέντες ὠμολόγουν ἅπαντες
 προθήσειν πλὴν Σωκράτους τοῦ Σωφρονίσκου. οὗτος δὲ οὐκ ἔφη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ
 τοὺς νόμους (ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ νόμον Xen.) πάντα ποιήσιν'. Quae omnia Phavorinum
 inseruisse puto.

σμός ὁ γενόμενος κατὰ τῶν περὶ Ἑρασινίδην στρατηγῶν, ὅτι τοὺς ἐν Ἀργι- 218 A
νούσσαις ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ ἀπολομένους οὐκ ἀνείλοντο. ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ ναυμα-
3 χία ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Καλλίου, τῆς Περικλέους τελευτῆς ὕστερον ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι
καὶ τέτταρσιν.

Ἄλλὰ μὲν καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ Πρωταγόρᾳ διάλογος, μετὰ τὴν Ἰππονίκου τελευ- V 59, B
6 τὴν γενόμενος παρειληφότος ἤδη τὴν οὐσίαν Καλλίου, τοῦ Πρωταγόρου
<μέμνηται> παραγεγονότος τὸ δεύτερον οὐ πολλαῖς πρότερον ἡμέραις. ὁ
δ' Ἰππόνικος ἐπὶ μὲν Εὐθυδήμου ἄρχοντος στρατηγῶν παρατίεταται μετὰ
9 Νικίου πρὸς Ταναγραίους καὶ τοὺς παραβοηθοῦντας Βοιωτῶν καὶ τῇ μάχῃ
νενίκηκε. τέθνηκε δὲ πρὸ τῆς ἐπ' Ἀλκαίου διδασκαλίας τῶν Εὐπόλιδος
Κολάκων οὐ πολλῷ χρόνῳ κατὰ τὸ εἶκός. πρόσφατον γὰρ τινα τοῦ C
12 Καλλίου τὴν παράληψιν τῆς οὐσίας ἐμφαίνει τὸ δρᾶμα. ἐν οὖν τούτῳ
τῷ δράματι Εὐπόλις τὸν Πρωταγόραν ὡς ἐπιδημοῦντα εἰσάγει, Ἀμεινίας
δ' ἐν τῷ Κόνῳ δύο πρότερον ἔτεσιν διδαχθέντι οὐ καταριθμεῖ αὐτὸν
15 ἐν τῷ τῶν φροντιστῶν χορῷ. δῆλον οὖν ὡς μεταξὺ τούτων τῶν χρόνων
παραγέγονεν.

Ὁ δὲ Πλάτων καὶ τὸν Ἡλεῖον Ἰππῖαν συμπαρόντα ποιεῖ ἐν τῷ Πρω-
18 ταγόρᾳ μετὰ τινων ἰδίων πολιτῶν, οὓς οὐκ εἶκός ἐν Ἀθήναις ἀσφαλῶς
διατρίβειν πρὸ τοῦ τὰς ἐνιαυσίας ἐπὶ Ἰσάρχου [τοῦ] Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος συντε- D
λεσθῆναι σπονδὰς. ὁ δὲ τὸν διάλογον <οὐχ> ὑφίσταται γινόμενον περὶ
21 τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους καθ' οὓς αἱ σπονδαὶ προσφάτως ἐγεγόνεσαν· λέγει
γούν· 'εἰ γὰρ εἶεν ἄνθρωποι ἄγριοι οἴους πέρυσσι Φερεκράτης ὁ ποιητῆς
ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ'. ἐδιδάχθησαν δὲ οἱ Ἀγριοὶ ἐπ' Ἀριστίωνος ἄρχον-
24 τος, ἀφ' οὗ ἐστὶν ἄρχων Ἀστύφιλος, πέμπτος ὢν ἀπὸ Ἰσάρχου, καθ' ὃν αἱ E
σπονδαὶ ἐγένοντο. Ἰσαρχος γὰρ, εἰτ' Ἀμεινίας, μεθ' ὃν Ἀλκαῖος, εἰτ'
Ἀριστίων, εἰτ' Ἀστύφιλος. παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν οὖν ὁ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ δια-
27 λόγῳ εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας παράγει πολεμίους ὄντας τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἰππῖαν, μὴ
τῆς ἐκεχειρίας αὐτῆς μενούσης.

5 *Protag.* 309 D, 310 E 10 Εὐπόλιδος] *Diog. Laert. Prot.* IX 50
13 εἰσάγει] *fr.* 146 a, I 297 Kock ἔνδον μὲν ἐστὶ Πρωταγόρας ὁ Τῆμος, *Diels Prot.*
A 11 14 Κόνῳ] *fr.* 11, I 673 Kock 17 Ἰππῖαν] *Diels Vors. Hippias*
A 5 *Protag.* 314 C, 315 B 20 σπονδὰς] *Thucyd.* IV 117—118,
Diod. Sic. XII 72 22 *Protag.* 327 D 23 Ἀγριοὶ] I 146 Kock

7 <μέμνηται> add. Casaubonus 14 ἐν τῷ κοινῷ A : corr. Casaubonus
17 ἐν delevit Wilamowitz, sed cfr *Xen. Hell.* IV 6,1, *Demosth.* XXIV 158.
18 οὓς Musurus : ὡς A 19 [τοῦ] del. Musurus 20 <οὐχ> addidi
cum Schweighäuser 23 ἐπιλήναια A

Ael. Arist. <Ἔτι δὲ ἐν τῷ Μενεξένῳ πολλὰ παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἀμαρτάνει.> ὑπόκει-
 II 370 ται μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ δήπου Σωκράτης τὸν ἐπιτάφιον διεξιὼν, μέμνηται δὲ
 τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τετελευτηκότων καὶ τῶν ἐν Λεχαίῳ καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης τῆς 3
 ἐπ' Ἀνταλκίδου κληθείσης. καίτοι ἐτελεύτησε μὲν Σωκράτης ἐπὶ Λάχηςτος
 ἄρχοντος, τῆς δ' ἐν Κορίνθῳ μάχης καὶ τῆς ἐν Λεχαίῳ μέσος ἄρχων Εὐβου-
 λίδης ἀπὸ δὲ Λάχηςτος εἰς Εὐβουλίδην ἑβδομος ἄρχων Εὐβουλίδης αὐτός, 6
 ἀπὸ δὲ Εὐβουλίδου πάλιν ἄρχων ὄγδοος Θεόδοτος, ἐφ' οὗ ἡ εἰρήνη ἐγένετο.
 ὁμοῦ τετταρεσκαίδεκα οἱ σύμπαντες ἄρχοντες εἰς τὴν εἰρήνην ἀπὸ Λάχηςτος
 ἄρχοντος, ὥστε οὐ μόνον Σωκράτης οὐδὲν ἐοράκει τούτων ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἡπί- 9
 στατο δήπουθεν εἰ γενήσεται, οὐδ' ἂν τὸ δαιμόνιον προύλεγεν αὐτῷ περὶ
 τῶν τοσούτων μετ' αὐτόν.

3. De similitate, quae inter Platonem et Xenophontem intercessit.

ATHENAEVS XI 112, p. 504 E—505 C, V 60, p. 218 F—219 A.

V 112, 504 E Εἰς ταῦτά τις ἀποβλέπων τὰ τοῦ καλοῦ Ξενοφῶντος ἐπιγινώσκων δυνήσε- 12
 ται ἦν εἶχε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ λαμπρότατος Πλάτων ζηλοτυπίαν. ἡ τάχα φιλο-
 νείκως εἶχον ἀρχῆθεν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ ἄνδρες οὗτοι, αἰσθόμενοι τῆς ἰδίας
 ἐκάτερος ἀρετῆς, καὶ ἴσως καὶ περὶ πρωτείων διεφέροντο, οὐ μόνον ἐξ ὧν 15
 περὶ Κύρου εἰρήκασιν τεκμαιρομένοις ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὑποθέσεων.
 συμπόσια μὲν γὰρ γεγράφασιν ἀμφοτέροι, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁ μὲν τὰς ἀλλή-
 F τριδας ἐκβάλλει, ὁ δὲ εἰσάγει· καὶ ὁ μὲν [ὥς πρόκειται], παραιτεῖται πίνειν 18
 μεγάλοις ποτηρίοις, ὁ δὲ τὸν Σωκράτην παραγεί τῷ ψυκτῆρι πίνοντα μέχρῃ
 τῆς ἔω.

Κὰν τῷ Περὶ ψυχῆς δὲ ὁ Πλάτων καταλεγόμενος ἕκαστον τῶν παρατυχόν- 21
 των οὐδὲ κατὰ μικρὸν τοῦ Ξενοφῶντος μέμνηται.

Καὶ περὶ τοῦ Κύρου οὗν ὁ μὲν λέγει ὥς ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ἐπεπαίδευτο
 505 πάντα τὰ πάτρια, ὁ δὲ Πλάτων ὥστερ' ἐναντιούμενος ἐν τρίτῳ Νόμῳ 24

2 τὸν ἐπιτάφιον] Menex. 237 B sqq.

13 ζηλοτυπίαν] Gell. Noct. Att. XIV

3, Diog. Laert. III 34, Marcellin. vita Thuc. 27, Aristocles ap. Euseb. Praep. ev. XV 793 B

18 ἐκβάλλει] Conv. 176 E

εἰσάγει] Conv. c. 2

παραιτεῖται] Conv. cap. 2,24

19 ψυκτῆρι] Conv. 213 E, cfr Ath. 502 D

μέχρῃ τῆς ἔω] Conv. 223 C

21 Phaed. 59 B

23 ὁ μὲν] Cyrop. I 2,2

ἐπαιδεύθη γε μὴν ἐν Περσῶν νόμοις

24 Leg. III 694 CD

1 <Ἔτι — ἀμαρτάνει> ita fere supplendum censui

8 τετταρεσκαίδεκα

Palmerius : τε γὰρ εξκαιδεκα codd.

12 Lemma in A : Πλάτων καὶ Ξενοφῶν

καὶ φιλοτιμῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους διέκειντο

18 [ὥς πρόκειται] Athenaeus ipse

addidit, quae p. 504 D dixit respiciens

φησί· 'μαντεύομαι δὲ περὶ Κύρου τὰ μὲν ἄλλα στρατηγὸν αὐτὸν ἀγαθὸν 505 A
εἶναι καὶ φιλόπονον, παιδείας δ' ὀρθῆς οὐδὲ ἤφθαι τὸ παράπαν, οἰκονομία
3 δ' οὐδ' ἥτινιοῦν προσεσχηκέναι. ἔοικε δὲ ἐκ νέου στρατεύεσθαι, παραδοὺς
τε τοὺς παῖδας ταῖς γυναιξὶ τρέφειν.'

Πάλιν ὁ μὲν Ξενοφῶν συναβὰς Κύρῳ εἰς Πέρσας μετὰ τῶν μυρίων 'Ελ-
6 λήνων καὶ ἀκριβῶς εἰδὼς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Θεσσαλοῦ Μένωνος, ὅτι αὐτὸς
αἷτιος ἐγένετο τοῖς περὶ Κλέαρχον τῆς ἀπωλείας τῆς ὑπὸ Τισσαφέρνην Β
γενομένης, καὶ οἷός τις ἦν τὸν τρόπον, ὡς χαλεπός, ὡς ἀσελγής, διηγῆσατο,
9 ὁ δὲ καλὸς Πλάτων μονονουχὶ εἰπὼν 'οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος' ἐγκώμια
αὐτοῦ διεξέρχεται, ὁ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπαξιαπλῶς κακολογήσας, ἐν μὲν τῇ Πολι-
τεΐᾳ "Ομηρον ἐκβάλλων καὶ τὴν μιμητικὴν ποίησιν, αὐτὸς δὲ τοὺς διαλόγους
12 μιμητικῶς γράψας, ὧν τῆς ἰδέας οὐδ' αὐτὸς εὗρετῆς ἔστιν. [πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ
τοῦθ' εἶρε τὸ εἶδος τῶν λόγων ὁ Τῆμος Ἀλεξαμενός, ὡς Νικίας ὁ
Νικαεὺς ἱστορεῖ καὶ Σωτίων. Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ ποιητῶν C
15 οὕτως γράφει· 'οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ἐμμέτρους τοὺς καλουμένους Σώφρονος μίμους
μὴ φῶμεν εἶναι λόγους καὶ μιμήσεις ἢ τοὺς Ἀλεξαμενοῦ τοῦ Τηίου τοὺς
πρώτους γραφέντας τῶν Σωκρατικῶν διαλόγων,' ἀντικρὺς φάσκων ὁ πολυ-
18 μαθέστατος Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸ Πλάτωνος διαλόγους γεγραφέναι τὸν Ἀλεξα-
μενόν.]

8 χαλεπός, ἀσελγής aliter Xen.

9 Stes. fr. 11 Diehl, Plat. *Phaedr.* 244 A

ἐγκώμια minime

11 ἐκβάλλων cfr Heracliti *Quaest. Hom.* (Oelmann) 4

ἐρρίφθω δὲ καὶ Πλάτων ὁ κόλαξ καὶ Ὀμήρου σκκοφάντης, ἐνδοξον ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας
πολιτείας τὸν φηγάδα προπέμπων λευκοῖς ἐρίοις (*Rep.* 398 A) ἀνεστεμμένον καὶ πολυ-
τελεῖ μύρῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν διάβροχον, cfr c. 12, 6, p. 20, 7 Oelmann ὁ φηγαδεύων "Ομηρον
ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας πολιτείας σγκατανωεῖ Πλάτων, Joseph. *contra Ap.* II 223 Niese, Just.
Cohort. ad Graecos 5 et 24, PGM VI p. 252 et 284, Orig. *contra Celsum* IV 57,
PGM XI, 1084 D, Theodoret. *serm.* 2 de principio, Greg. Naz. *or.* 25, PGM XXXV,
1205 A, Min. Fel. 23, 2

14 Aristot. fr. 72 Rose, Diog. Laert. II 48.

1 δέ : δὴ νῦν Plato περὶ γε Κύρου Plato ἄλλ' αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν τε
ἀγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ φιλόπολιν Plato 2 οὐχ ἤφθαι Plato οἰκονομία τε

οὐδὲν τὸν νοῦν προσεσχηκέναι. — KA. Πῶς δὴ τὸ τοιοῦτον φῶμεν; — AΘ. Ἐοικεν
Plato 3 οὐδῆτινι οὖν A 4 ταῖς γυναιξὶ παραδοὺς τοὺς παῖδας τρέφειν

Plato 6 αὐτὸς : οὗτος malim cum Kaibel 8 διηγησαμένον· ὁ καλὸς
Πλάτων A διηγησάμενος φαίνεται, ὁ δὲ Πλάτων E, correxi 12 quae uncis

inclusi fortasse addidit Phavorinus 14 σωτηρίων A: corr. Ionsius

15 οὐκουν Jahn ἐμμέτρους ὄντας Kaibel 16 λόγους ἢ μὴ μιμήσεις

τοὺς Jahn λόγους καὶ μὴ μιμήσεις ἢ τοὺς Bernhardt λόγους καὶ μιμήσεις μὴ τοὺς
Kaibel 17 τοὺς πρότερον (προτέρους Dobree) γραφέντας Bake Meineke Rose

τοὺς πρότερον γραφέντας τῶν Σωκρατικῶν διαλόγους Kaibel

- V 60, 218 E *Κὰν ἄλλοις δ' ὁ Πλάτων φησὶ Χαιρεφῶντα ἐρωτῆσαι τὴν Πυθίαν εἴ τις*
εἴη Σωκράτους σοφώτερος καὶ τὴν ἀνελεῖν μηδένα. κὰν τούτοις δὲ μὴ
συμφωνῶν Ξενοφῶν φησὶ 'Χαιρεφῶντος γὰρ ποτε ἐπερωτήσαντος 3
ἐν Δελφοῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἀνεῖλεν ὁ 'Απόλλων <πολλῶν> παρόντων μηδένα
 F *εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἐμοῦ μῆτε δικαιότερον μῆτε σωφρονέστερον.'* πῶς οὖν
εὐλογον ἢ πιθανὸν Σωκράτη τὸν ὁμολογοῦντα μηδὲν ἐπίστασθαι σοφώτατον 6
ἀπάντων ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα ἐπισταμένον θεοῦ ἀναρρηθῆναι; εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐστι
σοφία, τὸ μηδὲν εἰδέναι, τὸ πάντα εἰδέναι φανότις ἂν εἴη. τίς δ' ἦν χρεία
τῷ Χαιρεφῶντι παρενοχλεῖν τὸν θεὸν περὶ Σωκράτους πυνθανόμενον; αὐτὸς 9
γὰρ ἦν ἀξιόπιστος ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λέγων ὡς οὐκ ἐστι σοφός.
- 219 *'βλάξ γάρ τις ἦν τοιαῦτ' ἐρωτῶν τὸν θεόν,'*
ὡς ἂν εἰ καὶ τοιαῦτα, 12
'τίνα τῶν Ἀττικῶν ἐρίων ἄλλ' ἐστὶ μαλακώτερά',
 ἢ
'τῶν ἐν Βάκτροις καμῆλων εἰσὶ τινες δυνατώτεροί', 15
 ἢ
'εἰ Σωκράτους ἐστὶ τις σιμώτερος';
τοὺς γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα πυνθανομένους εὐστόχως ἐπιρραπίζει ὁ θεός, ὡς καὶ 18
τὸν πυνθόμενον, εἴτ' Αἰσωπὸς ἐστὶν ὁ λογοποιὸς ἢ ἄλλος τις,
'πῶς ἂν πλουτήσαιμι, Διὸς καὶ Αἰητοῦς νιέ,'
χλευάζων ἀπεκρίνατο, 21
'εἰ τὸ μέσον κτήσαιο Κορίνθου καὶ Σικυνῶνος.'

1 Plat. *Apol.* 21 A, Diog. Laert. II 37, *Schol. in Aristoph. Nub.* 144, Plut. *adv. Col.* 17 p. 1116 E (ὁ Κολώτης) διηγησάμενος ὅτι χρησμὸν ἐκ Δελφῶν περὶ Σωκράτους ἀνήνεγκε Χαιρεφῶν, ὃν ἴσμεν ἅπαντες, ταῦτα εἶρηκε· 'τὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Χαιρεφῶντος, διὰ τὸ τελέως σοφιστικὸν καὶ φορτικὸν διήγημα εἶναι, παρήσομεν.' Luc. *Amor.* 48 ἀνδρῶν σοφώτατος, ὃς ἅμα τοῖς ἄλλοις μαθήμασιν, ἐξ ὧν τὸν βίον ὦνησε, καὶ τὸ παιδεραστεῖν ὡς μάλιστα ὠφελοῦν προσήκατο similiter patres ecclesiae passim. 3 Xen. *Apol.* c. 14 11 βλάξ] trimetrum agnovit Dindorf, eiusdemque poetae comici frustula in eis quae sequuntur latere videntur 19 *Schol. in Aves* 968 Αἰσωπῶ τῷ μυθογράφῳ χρωμένῳ περὶ πλούτου ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν· 'εἰ τὸ μέσον— Σικυνῶνος,' Suid. s. v. εἰ τὸ μέσον, Zenob. *proverb. centur.* III 59, Eustath. *in Il. B* p. 291,30

3 Ξενοφῶντι A Ξενοφῶν Dindorf Ξενοφῶντι <ὃς> Casaubonus Ξενοφῶν, τί Schweighäuser 4 περὶ ἐμοῦ Xen. πολλῶν παρόντων ἀνεῖλεν ὁ 'Απόλλων Xen. πολλῶν om. A 5 μῆτε ἐλευθεριώτερον add. Xen. post ἐμοῦ 12 ἢ A : εἰ Kaibel 15 καμῆλων Boissonade: καὶ μῆδων A καὶ μῆδοις C 17 σιμώτερος AC : corr. Musurus 19 εἴτ' C : ἦτοι A

4. Philosophi maledicentiores quam comici sunt. ATHENAEVS V 61—63, p. 219 B—221 A. De malignitate Platonis ac gloriae cupiditate. ATHENAEVS XI 112—116, p. 504 E—507 E.

Ἄλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' ὢν ὁ Πλάτων εἶρηκε περὶ Σωκράτους τῶν κωμικῶν τις V 61, 219 A
εἶρηκεν, οὐθ' ὅτι μαλας βλοσυρᾶς νίδος ἦν, οὐθ' ὅτι Ξανθίππη χαλεπή ἦν
3 γυνή, ἣτις καὶ νιπτῆρας αὐτοῦ κατέχει τῆς κεφαλῆς, οὐθ' ὥς Ἀλκιβιάδῃ B
συνεκοιμήθη ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν γενόμενος χλαῖναν καίτοι ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῦτο
ἐκκωδωνισθῆναι ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ κατὰ Πλά-
6 τωνα· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐσέγησε τοῦτ' Ἀριστοφάνης <ὁ τὰ πάντα κατηγορῶν
αὐτοῦ> ὥς τοὺς νέους διαφθείροντος.

Ἀσπασία μέντοι ἡ σοφὴ τοῦ Σωκράτους διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν
9 λόγων ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις ὥς αὐτῆς ἔπασιν, ἅπερ Ἡ ρ ό δ ι κ ο ς ό Κρατή- C
τειος παρέθετο, φησὶν οὕτως.

ΑΣΠ. Σώκρατες, οὐκ ἔλαθές με πόθῳ δηχθεὶς φρένα τὴν σὴν
12 παιδὸς Δεινομάχης καὶ Κλεινίου. ἀλλ' ὑπάκουσον,
εἰ βούλει σοι ἔχειν εὖ παιδικά μὴδ' ἀπιθήσης
ἀγγέλῳ, ἀλλὰ πιθοῦ καὶ σοι πολὺ βέλτιον ἔσται.

15 ΣΩΚΡ. καγὼ ὅπως ἤκουσα, χαρᾶς ὑπο σῶμα λιπαίνω
ἰδρῶτι, βλεφάρων δὲ γόος πέσεν οὐκ ἀθελήτω.

D

1 Ael. Arist. ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων p. II 381 Dindorf: ἔπειτα τῆς μὲν κωμωδίας
κατηγορεῖς, αὐτὸς δὲ κωμωδεῖς Ἰππίαν Πρόδικον Πρωταγόραν Γοργίαν Εὐθύδημον
Διονυσόδωρον Ἀγάθωνα Κινησίαν πάντας ἀνθρώπους 2 Theaet. 149 A

3 νιπτῆρας] cfr Diog. Laert. II 37, Epictet. diss. ab Arriano dig. ed. Schenkel 1894,
p. 359, 33, Athen. 643 F, Ael. Var. Hist. XI 12, Senec. De const. sapientis 18
immunda aqua 4 Plat. Conv. 219 B, Luc. Amor. 49 δεῖ δὲ τῶν νέων ἐρᾶν ὥς

Ἀλκιβιάδου Σωκράτης, ὅς ὑπὸ μιᾷ χλανίδι πατρὸς ὕπνους ἐκοιμήθη, cfr Theocr. Id.
XVIII 19, Eurip. Peliae fr. 6, Ovid. Amor. I 4, 47, Propert. I 4, 14, Petron. 35.

8 διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν] Menex. 236 A, Schol. Aristoph. Acharn. 526, Xen.
Oec. III 16 11 PLG II 228 15 λιπαίνω] sudas Pers. Sat. II 54

1 οὐδὲν ὢν ὁ Πλάτων εἶπε περὶ Σ. οὐδὲ κωμικός τις C 5 Ἀριστοφάνους]
fortasse legendum Ἀλκιβιάδου 6 ita vel <οὔτε ἄλλος τῶν κατηγορούντων
αὐτοῦ> supplendum 12 δὲ ενομαχῆς A : corr. Musurus 15 ὅπως Mu-
surus: πῶς A λιπαίνω A : λιπάνθη Kaibel 16 γόος A : ῥόος Meineke
ἀθελήτως A : corr. Kaibel οὐκ ἐθελήτως Dobree

- 219 D ΑΣΠ. στέλλον πλησάμενος θυμὸν Μούσης κατόχοιο,
 ἤ τόνδ' αἰρήσεις, ὥσιν δ' ἐνίει ποθέουσιν.
 ἀμφοῖν γὰρ φιλίας ἥδ' ἀρχή· τῇδε καθέξεις
 αὐτόν, προσβάλλων ἀκοαῖς ὀπτήρια θυμοῦ. 3

κυνηγεῖ οὖν ὁ καλὸς Σωκράτης ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλον ἔχων τὴν Μιλησίαν,
 ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὸς θηρεύεται, ὥς ὁ Πλάτων ἔφη, λινιστατούμενος ὑπὸ 6
 Ἀλκιβιάδου. καὶ μὴν οὐ διαλείπει γε κλαίων ὥς ἄν, οἷμαι, δυσημερῶν.
 Εἰδοῦσα γὰρ αὐτόν ἐν οἷῳ ἦν καταστήματι Ἀσπασία φησίν.

- ΑΣΠ. τίπτε δεδάκρυσαι, φίλε Σώκρατες; ἢ σ' ἀνακινεῖ
 στέργοις ἐνναίων σκηπτὸς πόθου ὄμμασι θραυσθεῖς
 παιδὸς ἀνικήτου; τὸν ἐγὼ τιθασὸν σοι ὑπέστην
 ποιῆσαι; 12

- “Οτι δὲ ὄντως ἦρα τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου δῆλον ποιεῖ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ
 Πρωταγόρᾳ, καίτοι μικρὸν ἀπολείποντος τῶν τριάκοντα ἐτῶν. λέγει δ' 15
 F οὕτως· ‘πόθεν, ὦ Σώκρατες, φαίνει; ἢ δηλαδὴ ἀπὸ κυνηγεσίου τοῦ περὶ τὴν
 Ἀλκιβιάδου ὥραν; καὶ μὴν μοι καὶ πρόφην ἰδόντι καλὸς ἐφαίνετο ὁ ἀνὴρ
 ἔτι, — ἀνὴρ μέντοι, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὥς γε ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς εἰρησθαι, καὶ πάγω- 18
 220 νος ἤδη ὑποπιμπλάμενος. — εἴτα τί δὴ τοῦτ'; οὐ σὺ μέντοι Ὀμήρου ἐπαιné-
 της εἰ, ὃς ἔφη χαριεστάτην ἥβην εἶναι τοῦ ὑπηνήτου, ἣν νῦν Ἀλκιβιάδης
 αὐτὸς ἔχει.’ 21
 V 60 Περφύκασι δ' οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν φιλοσόφων τῶν κωμικῶν κακῆγοροι μᾶλ-
 λον εἶναι, εἴ γε καὶ Αἰσχίνης ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἐν μὲν τῷ Τηλαυγεῖ
 Κριτοβούλον τὸν Κρίτωνος ἐπ' ἀμαθίᾳ καὶ ὀυπαρότητι βίου κωμωδεῖ, τὸν 24

5 κυνηγεῖ] Protag. 309 A 6 λινιστατούμενος] cfr Plat. Conv. 217 CD
 ἐπιθέσθαι, ἐπιβεβουλευκέναι 15 Protag. 309 A 20 Od. κ 279, II. Ω
 348 23 Τηλαυγεῖ] fr. 41 Dittmar 24 Κριτόβουλον] Plat. Euthyd.
 306 D, Phaed. 59 B Xen. Mem. I 3,8, II 7,32

2 ηι τονδεργσεις Α : corr. Musurus ωσιδεων Α : ὥσιν Kaibel δ' ἐνίει
 Wilamowitz πόθοισιν Α : ποθέουσιν Bothe 3 φιλίης Bergk
 4 θελκτήρια θύμου Meineke 7 κλαίων Schweighäuser : καλλίων Α
 10 πόθου Iacobs: πόθος codd. θραυσθεῖς : ἔμφθεις malebat Iacobs
 11 ἀνικήτου Meineke 16 δηλαδὴ ὅτι ἀπὸ Plat. 17 καλὸς μὲν Plato
 ὁ om. Plato 18 αὐτοῖς ἡμῖν Plato 19 δὴ om. Plato 21 αὐτὸς
 om. Plato

δὲ Τηλανγὴν αὐτὸν ἱματίου μὲν φορήσεως καθ' ἡμέραν ἡμιωβέλιον κναφεῖ
 3 τελοῦντα μισθόν, κωδίῳ δὲ ἔξωσμένον καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα σπαρτίοις ἐνημ-
 μένον σαπριοῖς, καί<περ τελειότα>τον <ὄντα> ῥήτορα οὐ μετρίως διαγελᾷ. 220 B
 ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἀσπασίᾳ Ἰππόνικον μὲν τὸν Καλλίου κοάλεμον προσαγορεύει,
 τὰς δ' ἐκ τῆς Ἰωνίας γυναικας συλλήβδην μοιχάδας καὶ κερδαλέας. ὁ δὲ
 6 Καλλίας αὐτοῦ περιέχει τὴν τοῦ Καλλίου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα διαφορὰν καὶ τὴν
 Προδίκου καὶ Ἀναξαγόρου τῶν σοφιστῶν διαμώκησιν. λέγει γὰρ ὡς
 ὁ μὲν Πρόδικος Θηραμένην μαθητὴν ἀπετέλεσεν, ὁ δ' ἕτερος Φιλόξενον
 9 τὸν Ἐρύξιδος καὶ Ἀριφράδην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀριγνώτου τοῦ κιθαρωδοῦ, C
 θέλων ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν δηλωθέντων μοχθηρίας καὶ περὶ τὰ φαῦλα λιχνείας
 ἐμφανίσαι τὴν τῶν παιδευσάντων διδασκαλίαν. ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἀξιόχῳ πικρῶς
 12 Ἀλκιβιάδου κατατρέχει ὡς οἰνόφλυγος καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀλλοτρίας γυναικας
 σπουδάζοντος.

Ἀ ν τ ι σ θ έ ν η ς δ' ἐν θατέρῳ τῶν Κύρων κακολογῶν Ἀλκιβιάδην καὶ V 63
 15 παράνομον εἶναι λέγει καὶ εἰς γυναικας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλλην δίαιταν. συνεῖναι
 γὰρ φησιν αὐτὸν καὶ μητρὶ καὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ ἀδελφῇ, ὡς Πέρσας. ὁ δὲ Πολι-
 τικὸς αὐτοῦ διάλογος ἀπάντων καταδρομὴν περιέχει τῶν Ἀθῆναιων δημα- D
 18 γωγῶν, ὁ δ' Ἀρχέλαος Γοργίου τοῦ ῥήτορος, ἡ δ' Ἀσπασία τῶν Περι-
 κλέους υἱῶν Ξανθίππου καὶ Παράλου διαβολήν. τούτων γὰρ τὸν μὲν Ἀρχε-
 στρατοῦ φησὶν εἶναι συμβιωτὴν τοῦ παραπλήσια ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν μαρῶν οἰκη-
 21 μάτων ἐργαζομένου, τὸν δ' Εὐφῆμου συνήθη καὶ γνώριμον τοῦ φορτικῶς
 σκώπτοντος καὶ ψυχρὰ τοὺς συναντῶντας. καὶ Πλάτωνα δὲ μετονομάσας
 Σάθωνα ἀσυρῶς καὶ φορτικῶς τὸν ταύτην ἔχοντα τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν διάλογον
 24 ἐξέδωκε κατ' αὐτοῦ.

4 Ἀσπασίᾳ] fr. 16 Dittmar κοάλεμον] Aristoph. *Equit.* 198, 221
 6 Καλλίας] fr. 34 Dittmar 8 Θηραμένην *Apol.* 19 E, *Hipp. mai.* 282 B,
 Aristoph. *Plut.* 546 cum *scoliis*, *Plut. Nic.* 524 A, *Suidas*, *Heinze Prodikos v.*
Keos 319 Φιλόξενον] *Vesp.* 84 καταπύγων, *Eupol.* fr. 235, p. I 322 K.
 πόρνος, *Phryn.* fr. 47, p. I 382 K. πόρνος, alia permulta apud Dittmar p. 191, n. 26
 invenies 9 Ἀριφράδην] *Equit.* 1278, *Vesp.* 1271 cum *scoliis*, *Luc. schol.*
in Pseud. 3, alia *Crusius RE* II 824 11 Ἀξιόχῳ] fr. 12 Dittmar, cfr *Xen.*
Mem. I 2, 22 14 Κύρων] *Winckelmann* p. 17, Dittmar p. 306 15 Πολι-
 τικός] *Winckelmann* p. 22, Dittmar p. 14—15 18 Ἀρχέλαος] *Winckelmann*
 p. 22, *Dümmeler Akad.* p. 10 Ἀσπασία] *Winckelmann* p. 19, Dittmar p. 1
 23 Σάθωνα] *Winckelmann* p. 33, *Diog. Laert.* III 35, *Athen.* 507 A

2 κωδίῳ *Casaubonus* κωδίῳ *Masurus* : κωμωδίῳ A 3 καὶ <περ τελειότα>τον
 <ὄντα> *Pohlenz* : καὶ τελέσαντα τὸν A 15 λέγει C : λέγων A 16 ὡς
 τοὺς Πέρσας C 20 μαρῶν *Casaubonus* : μικρῶν *codd.*

- 220 E Τούτοις γὰρ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν οὐδείς ἀγαθὸς σύμβουλος εἶναι δοκεῖ, οὐ
στρατηγὸς νόμιμος, οὐ σοφιστὴς ἀξιόλογος, οὐ ποιητὴς ὠφέλιμος, οὐ δῆμος
εὐλόγιστος ἀλλ' ἢ Σωκράτης ὁ μετὰ τῶν Ἀσπασίας ἀνλητρίδων ἐπὶ τῶν 3
ἐργαστηρίων συνδιατρίβων καὶ Πίστωνι τῷ θωρακοποιῷ διαλεγόμενος καὶ
Θεοδότῃ διδάσκων τὴν ἐταῖραν ὥς δεῖ τοὺς ἐραστὰς παλεύειν, ὥς Ξενό-
φων παρίστησιν ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀπομνημονευμάτων. [τοιαῦτα γὰρ ποιεῖ 6
αὐτὸν παραγγέλματα τῇ Θεοδότῃ λέγοντα, ἃ οὔτε Νικῶ ἢ Σαμία ἢ Καλ-
F λιστράτῃ ἢ Λεσβία ἢ Φιλαινίδι ἢ Λευκαδία, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Πυ-
θόνικος συνεωράκασιν πόθων θέλγητρα· οὗτοι γὰρ περὶ ταῦτα ἡσχόληντο 9
περιττῶς. ἐπιλίποι δ' ἂν μ' ὁ πᾶς χρόνος, εἰ ἐκτίθεσθαι βουλευθείην τὰς
σεμνὰς τῶν φιλοσόφων μέμψεις. κατὰ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τὸν Πλάτωνα
'ἐπιρρεῖ δὲ ὄχλος μοι τοιούτων Γοργόνων καὶ Πηγάσων καὶ ἄλλων ἀμηχά- 12
221 νων πλήθει τε καὶ ἀτοπία τερατολόγων τινῶν φύσεων.' διόπερ κατασιω-
πήσομαι.]
- 505 C Διαβάλλει δὲ ὁ Πλάτων καὶ Θρασύμαχον τὸν Χαλκηδόνιον σοφιστὴν 15
ὅμοιον εἶναι λέγων τῷ ὀνόματι, ἔτι δ' Ἰππίαν καὶ Γοργίαν καὶ Παρμενίδην
καὶ ἐνὶ διαλόγῳ τῷ Πρωταγόρᾳ πολλοὺς, ὁ τοιαῦτα ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ εἰπὼν·

4 Xen. Mem. III 10,9 πρὸς δὲ Πιστίαν τὸν θωρακοποιὸν εἰσελθὼν 7 Θεοδότῃ]
Mem. III 11 12 Phaedr. 229 D 15 Θρασύμαχον] Phaedr. 267 CD
16 Ἰππίαν] Hipp. mai. 285 B sqq., cfr Prot. 315 B, Men. 91 E, Basil. epist.
II 135, PGM XXXII p. 572 C Πλάτων ... καὶ παρακωμῶδεῖ τὰ πρόσωπα, Θρα-
συμάχου μὲν τὸ θρασὺ καὶ ἱταμὸν διαβάλλων, Ἰππίου δὲ τὸ κοῦφον τῆς διανοίας καὶ
χαῖνον καὶ Πρωταγόρου τὸ ἀλαζονικὸν καὶ ὑπέρογκον 17 Πολιτεία] 562 C D
οἰνοχόων προστατούντων τύχῃ καὶ πορρωτέρῳ τοῦ δέοντος ἀκράτου αὐτῆς μεθυσθῇ,
Eustath. 1547,53 ἐμφαίνειν Εὐπολὶς λέγεται τὸν φυσικὸν Πρωταγόραν διακωμῶδῶν
ἐν τῷ 'ὅς ἀλαζονεύεται μὲν ἀλιτήριος περὶ τῶν μετεώρων, τὰ δὲ χαμᾶθεν ἐσθλεί',
Κόλακες fr. 146 b, I 297 K., Dionys. Hal. de Thuc. iudic. 816 αὐτὸς τε ὁ Πλάτων
Παρμενίδην καὶ Πρωταγόραν καὶ Ζήνωνα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φυσιολόγων οὐκ ὀλίγους
ἡμαρτηκότας ἀποδεικνύναι βούλεται

2 νόμιμος scripsi collato Sueton. in Tiber c. 21, φρόνιμος Casaubonus ὁ μῖμος A
οὐ μῖμος C οὐ δῆμος A : οὐ δημότης Wilamowitz οὐ δημότης <χρηστός, οὐκ
οἰκονόμος> εὐλόγιστος mavult Kaibel, fortasse scribendum δημηγόρος, cfr Xen.
Mem. II 6,15 et Cyrill. contra Iulian. VI, PGM 76, p. 780 D φιλόσοφοι, στρα-
τηγοί, δημηγόροι, νομοθέται 3 ἀλλ' ἢ Schweighäuser : ἀλλὰ A C 5 πα-
λεύειν Iacobs : ἀπολαύειν A 6 δευτέρῳ] lege γ' 10 ἐπιλείπει A με πᾶς
χρόνος A με πᾶς ὁ χρόνος C : corr. Dindorf 12 μοι om. Plato 13
πλήθει τε καὶ ἀτοπία A, cod. Platonis Paris. 1811, P. Oxy. 1016 : πλήθῃ — ἀτοπία
BT Platonis, Galen. de plac. Hippocr. et Plat. V 356 K. τερατολογίῳ τινῶν
φύσεως A

ἔταν, οἶμαι, δημοκρατουμένη πόλις ἐλευθερίας διηήσασα κακῶν οἰνοχόων 505 D
 τύχη καὶ ἀκράτου αὐτῆς μεθυσθῆ. λέγεται δὲ ὡς καὶ ὁ Γοργίας αὐτὸς XI 113
 3 ἀναγνούς τὸν δμώνυμον αὐτῷ διάλογον πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις ἔφη· ὡς καλῶς
 οἶδε Πλάτων λαμβίζειν. Ἐρμιππος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Γοργίου ὡς ἐπε-
 δήμησε, φησί, ταῖς Ἀθήναις Γοργίας μετὰ τὸ ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς
 6 ἐν Δελφοῖς ἑαυτοῦ χρυσῆς εἰκόνας, εἰπόντος τοῦ Πλάτωνος, ὅτε εἶδεν αὐτόν, Ε
 ἦκει ἡμῖν ὁ καλὸς τε καὶ χρυσοῦς Γοργίας, ἔφη ὁ
 Γοργίας, ἡ καλὸν γε αἰ Ἀθηναί [καὶ] νέον τοῦτον
 9 Ἀρχίλοχον ἐν νήοχασι ν. ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν ὡς ἀναγνούς ὁ Γορ-
 γίας τὸν Πλάτωνος διάλογον πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας εἶπεν ὅτι οὐδὲν τούτων
 οὗτ' εἶπεν οὗτ' ἤκουσε παρὰ Πλάτωνος. ταῦτα φασὶ καὶ Φαίδωνα εἰπεῖν
 12 ἀναγνόντα τὸν Περὶ ψυχῆς. διὸ καλῶς ὁ Τίμων περὶ αὐτοῦ ἔφη·

ὡς ἀνέπλαττε Πλάτων ὁ πεπλασμένα θαύματα εἰδώς.

Παρμενίδην μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔλθειν εἰς λόγους τὸν τοῦ Πλάτωνος Σωκράτην F
 15 μόλις ἢ ἡλικία συγχωρεῖ, οὐχ ὡς καὶ τοιοῦτους εἰπεῖν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι λόγους.
 τὸ δὲ πάντων σχετικώτερον καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν οὐδεμιᾶς κατεπειγούσης χρείας,
 ὅτι παιδικὰ γεγόνοι τοῦ Παρμενίδου Ζήνων ὁ πολίτης αὐτοῦ. ἀδύνατον δὲ
 18 καὶ Τίμαιον οὐ μόνον κατὰ Σωκράτην εἶναι, ἢ ποῦ γε καὶ ἐρῶμενον αὐτοῦ
 γεγονέναι. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐ δύνανται Πάραλος καὶ Ξάνθιππος οἱ Περικλέους 506
 υἱοὶ [τελευτήσαντες τῷ λοιμῷ] Πρωταγόρα διαλέγεσθαι, ὅτε <τὸ> δεύτερον
 21 ἐπεδήμησε ταῖς Ἀθήναις, οἱ <πολὺν> ἔτι πρότερον τελευτήσαντες <τῷ
 λοιμῷ>. πολλὰ δ' ἔστι καὶ ἄλλα λέγειν περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ δεικνύναι ὡς
 ἐπλαττε τοὺς διαλόγους.

3 Diels⁴, 76 A 15 a 4 Hermippi fragm., ed. A. Lozynski, Bonn 1832, p.
 112, FHG III 48, Plin. Nat. hist. XXXIII 4, 24, Cic. De Orat. III 32, 129, Dio
 Chrys. XXXVII 28, Val. Max. VIII 15, Paus. VI 17, 7, Diels⁴, 76 A 7 12 Timon
 fr. 19 Diels Poetarum philos. fragm., fr. 52 Wachsmuth, Diog. Laert. III 26, Suidas
 s. v. παραγραμμάτιζων, Hesych. Miles. in vita Platonis p. 45 Flach 14
 Παρμενίδην] Macrob. Sat. I 1, 5 quod licito fieri Platonis dialogi testimonio sunt,
 quippe Socrate ita Parmenides antiquior, ut huius pueritia uix illius adprehenderit se-
 nectutem, et tamen inter illos de rebus arduis disputatur. inclitum dialogum Socrates
 habita cum Timaeo disputatione consumit, quos constat eodem saeculo non fuisse.
 Paralus uero et Xanthippus, quibus Pericles pater fuit, cum Protagora apud Platonem
 disserunt secundo adventu Athenis morante, quos multo ante infamis illa pestilentia
 absumpserat.

8 [καὶ] del. Meineke 11 παρὰ Πλάτωνος del. Rossi 13 ἀνέπλαττεν
 ὁ Πλάτων πεπλασμένα A : transp. Nauck θύματα A : corr. e Diog. Laert. III 26
 16 σχετικώτερον A : -ώτατον epitomator 18 Τίμαιον Macrobius : Φαίδρον A
 20 [τελευτήσαντες τῷ λοιμῷ] del. Kaibel 20 <τὸ> add. Kaibel
 21 <πολὺν> addidi collato Macr. multo ante οἱ ε' ἔτι πρότερον Casaubonus

- XI 114 "Οτι δὲ καὶ δυσμενῆς ἦν πρὸς ἅπαντας, δῆλον καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰωνί
ἐπιγραφομένῳ, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτον μὲν κακολογεῖ πάντας τοὺς ποιητάς, ἔπειτα 3
καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου προαγομένους, Φανοσθένη τὸν Ἀνδριον κάπολ-
λόδαρον τὸν Κυζικηνόν, ἔτι δὲ τὸν Κλαζομένιον Ἑρακλείδην, ἐν δὲ τῷ
506 B Μένωνι καὶ τοὺς μεγίστους παρ' Ἀθηναίοις γενομένους Ἀριστείδην καὶ
Θεμιστοκλέα, Μένωνα δὲ ἐπαινεῖ τὸν τοὺς Ἑλλήνας προδόντα. ἐν δὲ τῷ 6
Εὐθύδημῳ <Εὐθύδημον> καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Διονυσόδωρον προπηλακί-
ζων καὶ καλῶν ὀφισμαθεῖς ἔτι τε ἐριστὰς ὀνομάζων ὀνειδίζει αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν
ἐκ Χίου τῆς πατρίδος φυγὴν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐν Θουρίοις κατωκίσθησαν. 9
Ἐν δὲ τῷ Περὶ ἀνδρείας Μεληοῖαν τὸν Θουκυδίδου τοῦ ἀντιπολιτευσα-
μένου Περικλεῖ καὶ Λυσίμαχον τὸν Ἀριστείδου τοῦ δικαίου, τῆς τῶν πατέ-
C ρων ἀρετῆς ἀναξίους εἶναι φάσκων. ἃ δὲ περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου εἴρηκεν ἐν τῷ 12
Συμποσίῳ οὐδ' εἰς φῶς λέγεσθαι ἔστιν ἄξιον, ἔν τε τῷ προτέρῳ τῶν εἰς
αὐτὸν διαλόγων. [ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος ὑπὸ τινων Ξενοφώντος εἶναι λέγεται, ὡς
καὶ ἡ Ἀλκυὼν Λέοντος τοῦ Ἀκαδημαῖκοῦ, ὡς φησι Νικίας ὁ Νικαεὺς.] 15
τὰ μὲν οὖν κατὰ Ἀλκιβιάδου λεχθέντα σιωπῶ, ὅτι δὲ τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον
εἰκαῖον εἴρηκε κριτὴν, Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ ἐπαινῶν ἐπαινεῖ καὶ τοὺς πάντων

1 Dionys. Hal. *ep. ad Pomp.* 755, Usener-Radermacher p. 225,2 τί θανμαστὸν
ἐποιοῦν ἐγὼ τοῖς Δημοσθένους λόγοις συγκρίνων τοὺς Πλάτωνος καὶ εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς
ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔχειν ᾧμιν ἐπιλογιζόμενος; ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰς ἄλλας αὐτοῦ γραφὰς παραφέρειν,
ἐν αἷς κωμῶδει τοὺς πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ, Παρμενίδην τε καὶ Ἰππῖαν καὶ Πρωταγόραν καὶ
Πρόδικον καὶ Γοργίαν καὶ Πῶλον καὶ Θεόδωρον καὶ Θρασύμαχον καὶ ἄλλους συγχρούς,
οὐκ ἀπὸ βελτίστον πάντα περὶ αὐτῶν γραφῶν, ἀλλ' εἰ βούλει καὶ ἀπὸ φιλοτιμίας. ἦν γάρ,
ἦν ἐν τῇ Πλάτωνος φύσει πολλὰς ἀρετὰς ἐχούση τὸ φιλότιμον. ἐδήλωσε δὲ τοῦτο
μάλιστα διὰ τῆς πρὸς Ὀμηρον ζηλοτυπίας, ὃν ἐκ τῆς κατασκευαζομένης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ
πολιτείας ἐκβάλλει στεφανώσας καὶ μύρω χρίσας (*Rep.* 398 A), ὡς δὴ τοῦτου (τούτων
codd.) αὐτῷ δέον ἐκβαλλομένου (ἐκβαλλομένῳ codd.), δι' ὃν ἡ τε ἄλλη παιδεία
πᾶσα παρῆλθεν εἰς τὸν βίον καὶ τελευτῶσα φιλοσοφία. *Ion* p. 534, 541 CD,
Ael. Var. hist. XIV 5 3 Φανοσθένη] *Xen. Hell.* I 5,18—19 4 Ἑρα-
κλείδην] *Ath. rep.* 41,3 5 *Men.* 93 C, 94 A 7 *Euth.* 271 C ἀπέκησαν
δὲ ἐς Θουρίους φεύγοντες δὲ ἐκεῖθεν 10 *Lach.* 179 C 11 τῆς
— φάσκων] ἡμέτερα δ' αὐτῶν ἔργα οὐδέτερος ἔχει λέγειν Plato 15 Νικίας
— cfr *Diog. Laert.* III 62 17 εἰκαῖον] cfr *Alc.* I 122 B τῆς δὲ σῆς γενέ-
σεως, ὃ Ἀλκιβιάδης, καὶ τροφῆς καὶ παιδείας ἡ ἄλλου ὁτιοῦν Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἔπος

2 ἐπιγραφομένων A: -μένῳ epitomator 7 <Εὐθύδημον> maluit Schweighäuser
<καὐτόν> καὶ τὸν Meineke Διονυσόδωρον A 8 ὀνομάζων ex ὀνειδίζων
corr. A, del. Kaibel 11 scil. κακολογεῖ 14 quae uncis inclusi, fortasse
addidit e suo penore Phaurinus 16 ὅτι] ἔτι Casaubonus δημονικαῖον
A: corr. Musurus 17 εὐπρόκωπον sec. Casaubonum ἔτι τε πρόκωπον sec.
Kaibel post κριτὴν add. A

- Ἑλλήνων ἐχθροὺς Πέρσας. καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν δὲ τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου Κλεινίαν 506 D
 μαινόμενόν τε ἀποφαίνει καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ ἡλιθίους. Μειδίαν τε ὄρτυγο-
 3 κόπον καὶ τὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον εὐπρόσωπον μὲν εἶναι, δεῖν δ' αὐτὸν
 ἀποδύσαντας θεωρεῖν. ὀφθήσεται γάρ φησι περιβλεπτον ἀξίωμα περικει-
 μενος κάλλους οὐκ ἀληθινοῦ.
 6 Ἐν δὲ τῷ Κίμωνι οὐδὲ τῆς Θεμιστοκλέους φεῖδεται κατηγορίας οὐδὲ τῆς XI 115
 Ἀλκιβιάδου καὶ Μυρωνίδου, ἀλλ' οὐδ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κίμωνος. καὶ ὁ Κρίτων
 δ' αὐτοῦ <Κρίτωνος, ἡ δὲ Πολιτεία καὶ> Σοφοκλέους περιέχει καταδρομήν,
 9 ὁ δὲ Γοργίας οὐ μόνον ἀφ' οὗ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀρχελάου τοῦ Μακε- E
 δονίας βασιλέως, ὃν οὐ μόνον ἐπονείδιστον γένος ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ ἀπέ-
 κτεινε τὸν δεσπότην.
 12 Οὗτος δ' ἐστὶ Πλάτων, ὃν Σπεύσιππος φησι φίλτατον ὄντα [Ἀρχελάω]

εἰπεῖν, οὐδενὶ μέλει, *Alcyon*. c. 3 εἰκόμην ἡμεῖς τῶν δυνατῶν τε καὶ ἀδυνάτων ἀμβλυ-
 ωποὶ τινας εἶναι κριταὶ πάντεσσι, *Alc.* I 113 D οἶμαι μὲν ὀλιγάκις Ἀθηναίους
 βουλευέσθαι πότερα δικαίωτερα ἢ ἀδικώτερα κτλ., 118 B πέπονθας δὲ τοῦτο (ἀμαθία
 συνοικεῖν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ) οὐ σύ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν πραττόντων τὰ τῆσδε τῆς
 πόλεως, 119 B δοκοῦσι γάρ μοι οἱ τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράττοντες ἐκτὸς ὀλίγων ἀπαίδευτοι
 εἶναι Λακεδαιμονίους — Πέρσας] *Alc.* I 120 E sqq 1 Κλεινίαν]
Alc. I 118 F 2 αὐτοῦ] scil. Periclis filios Μειδίαν] *Alc.* I 120 A
 ὄρτυγοκόπον *Schol. in Luc. Iuxp. Trag.* 48, Jacobitz p. 186, ὁ δὲ Μειδίας
 ὄρτυγοκόπος ἦν, ὡς Πλάτων *Περιαλγεῖ* (Kock I 630) *Schol. in Plat. Alc.* I
 120 A εἰρωνικῶς. οὗτος ἐπὶ κύκλον τοὺς ὄρτυγας παριστὰς κόπτειν αὐτοὺς ἀλλήλους
 ἐδίδασκεν, cfr *Schol. in Arist. Aves* 1297, *Suid.* s. v., *Polluc.* VII 136, IX 107
 3 *Alc.* I 132 A εὐπρόσωπος γάρ ὁ τοῦ μεγαλήτορος δῆμος Ἐρεχθίδης, ἀλλ' ἀποδύντα
 χρὴ αὐτὸν θεάσασθαι 7 *Crit.* 45 AB, *Rep.* 329 C 11 9 Ἀρχελάου] *Gorg.*
 471 A—C 12 Σπεύσιππος] *ep. Socr.* XXX 12 Bickermann-Sykutris: πυνθάνομαι
 δὲ καὶ Θεόπομπον παρ' ὑμῖν μὲν εἶναι πάννυχρόν, περὶ δὲ Πλάτωνος βλασφημεῖν, καὶ
 ταῦθ' ὥσπερ οὐ Πλάτωνος τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ Περδίκκου κατασκευάσαντος καὶ
 διὰ τέλους χαλεπῶς φέροντος, εἴ τι γίγνοιτο παρ' ὑμῖν ἀνήμερον ἢ μὴ φιλάδελφον («als
 ob nicht gerade Plato zur Zeit des Perdikkas den Grund für deine Herrschaft gelegt
 hätte und es ihm nicht allzeit schmerzlich gewesen wäre, wenn irgend etwas Rohes
 oder Liebloses zwischen den Brüdern vorfiel.»). Ἰν' οὖν Θεόπομπος παύσῃται τραχὺς
 ὢν, κέλευσον Ἀντίπατρον παραγνῶναι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν πράξεων αὐτῷ καὶ γινώσεται
 Θεόπομπος δικαίως (μὲν) ὑπὸ πάντων ἐξαλειφόμενος, ἀδίκως δὲ τῆς παρὰ σοῦ χορηγίας
 τυγχάνων. Cfr *Theopomp. fr.* 294 Jac. = *Diog. Laert.* III 40, et *ep. Plat.* 5.

- 1 Κλεινίαν Valckenaar : καὶ Νικίαν **AE** 2 ἀποφαίνει **A** : ἀποκαλεῖ **E**
 αὐτοῦ **A** : αὐ τοῦ <Περικλέους> Valckenaar ὄρτυγοτρόφον Plato
 6 Θεμιστοκλέους **A** : Περικλέους **E** 7 Ἀλκιβιάδου : τῆς Περικλέους Dobree
 Μυρωνίδου: Μιλτιάδου Casaubonus 8 <Κρίτωνος — καὶ> Wilamowitz
 12 Ἀρχελάω] delendum : Περδίκκα sribendum esse conii. Gomperz

- 506 Ε Φιλίππῳ τῆς βασιλείας αἴτιον γενέσθαι. γράφει γοῦν Καρύστιος ὁ
Περγαμηνὸς ἐν τοῖς Ἱστορικοῖς Ὑπομνήμασιν οὕτως· Ὑπεύσιππος πυν-
θανόμενος Φίλιππον βλασφημεῖν περὶ Πλάτωνος εἰς ἐπιστολὴν ἔγραψεν 3
τοιοῦτον. ὥσπερ ἀγνοοῦντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι καὶ τὴν
F ἀρχὴν τῆς βασιλείας Φίλιππος διὰ Πλάτωνος ἔσχευ·
Εὐφραῖον γὰρ ἀπέστειλε τὸν Ὠρεΐτην πρὸς Περδίκκαν Πλάτων, ὃς ἔπεισεν 6
ἀπομερίσαι τινὰ χώραν Φιλίππῳ. διατρέφων δ' ἐνταῦθα δύναμιν, ὡς ἀπέ-
θανε Περδίκκας, ἐτοίμου δυνάμεως ὑπαρχούσης ἐπέπεσε τοῖς πράγμασι.
τοῦτο δ' εἶπερ οὕτως ἀληθείας ἔχει, θεὸς ἂν εἰδεῖν. 9
Ὁ δὲ καλὸς αὐτοῦ Πρωταγόρας πρὸς τῷ καταδρομῇ ἔχει πολλῶν ποιη-
τῶν καὶ σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκθεατριζόμενον ἔχει καὶ τὸν Καλλίου βίον μᾶλλον
τῶν Εὐπόλιδος Κολάκων. ἐν δὲ τῷ Μενεξένῳ οὐ μόνον Ἰππίας ὁ Ἡλείος 12
χλευάζεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Ῥαμνούσιος Ἀντιφῶν καὶ ὁ μουσικὸς Λάμπρος.
507 Ἐπιλίποι δ' ἂν με ἡ ἡμέρα, εἰ πάντας ἐθελήσαιμι ἐπειθεῖν τοὺς κακῶς
ἀκούσαντας ὑπὸ τοῦ σοφοῦ. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' Ἀντισθένην ἔπαινω· καὶ γὰρ 15
καὶ οὗτος πολλοὺς εἰπὼν κακῶς οὐδ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἀπέσχετο, ἀλλὰ
καλέσας αὐτὸν φορτικῶς Σάθωνα τὸν ταύτην ἔχοντα τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν διά-
λογον ἐξέδωκεν. 18
XI 116 Ἡ γήσασθαι δὲ ὁ Δελφὸς ἐν τοῖς Ὑπομνήμασι περὶ τῆς πρὸς πάν-
τας τοῦ Πλάτωνος κακοηθείας λέγων γράφει καὶ ταῦτα· μετὰ τὴν Σωκρά-
τους τελευτὴν ἐπὶ πλεῖον τῶν συνήθων ἀθυμούντων ἐν τινι συνουσίᾳ Πλά- 21
των συμπαρὼν λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον παρεκάλει μὴ ἀθυμεῖν αὐτούς, ὡς ἱκανὸς
B αὐτὸς εἶη ἡγεῖσθαι τῆς σχολῆς, καὶ προέειπεν Ἀπολλοδώρῳ. καὶ ὃς εἶπεν
ἡδίων ἂν παρὰ Σωκράτους τὴν τοῦ φαρμάκου κύλικα εἰλήφειν ἢ παρὰ σοῦ 24
τὴν τοῦ οἴνου πρόποσιν.
Ἐδόκει γὰρ Πλάτων φθονερός εἶναι καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἥθος οὐδαμῶς εὐδοκι-
μεῖν. καὶ γὰρ Ἀρίστιππον πρὸς Διονύσιον ἀποδημήσαντα ἔσκωπτεν, αὐτὸς 27

1 FHG Müller IV 357

6 Εὐφραῖος, ὄνομα κύριον, Ὠρεΐτης δ' ἦν τῷ γένει, μετέσχε δὲ τῆς τοῦ Πλάτωνος διατριβῆς Suidas e Plat. ep. 5, p. 321 C, cfr Dem. IX 59—62

12 Menex. 236 A, Hippias in Menexeno non memoratur

14 cfr Dion. Chrys. or. LV 12 Arnim: οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ τοὺς περὶ Γοργίαν ἢ Πῶλον ἢ Θρασύμαχον ἢ Περσικόν ἢ Μένωνα ἢ Εὐθύφρονα ἢ Ἄντων ἢ Ἀλκιβιάδην ἢ Λάχητα μάτην ἐποίει λέγοντας

19 Hegesander FHG IV 412

πρὸς πάντας] Joh. Chrys. hom. IV in Acta Ap. ζηλοτύπως πρὸς ἅπαντας διακείμενος

27 Ἀρίστιππον] Diog. Laert. III 36

9 εἶπερ οὕτως codd. : πῶς mavult Peppink

corr. Dindorf

15 Ἀντισθένη codd. : correxi

14 ἐπιλίποι A ἐπιλήπη E :

quirit ἐδεξάμην Kaibel

24 εἰλήφειν pessime : re-

τρὶς εἰς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεύσας, ἅπαξ μὲν τῶν ῥυάκων χάριν, ὅτε καὶ τῷ 507 C
 πρεσβυτέρῳ Διονυσίῳ συγγενόμενος ἐκινδύνευσεν, δις δὲ πρὸς τὸν νεώτερον
 3 Διονύσιον. Αἰσχίνου τε πένητος ὄντος καὶ μαθητὴν ἓνα ἔχοντος Ξενοκρά-
 την, τοῦτον περιέσπασεν. καὶ Φαίδωνι δὲ τὴν τῆς δουλείας ἐφιστὰς δίκην
 ἐφωράθη. καὶ τὸ καθόλου πᾶσι τοῖς Σωκράτους μαθηταῖς ἐπεφύκει μη-
 6 τριῶς ἔχων διάθεσιν. διόπερ Σωκράτης οὐκ ἀηδῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ στοχαζό-
 μενος ἐνύπνιον ἔφησεν ἑωρακέναι πλειόνων παρόντων. δοκεῖν γὰρ ἔφη τὸν
 Πλάτωνα κορώνην γενόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν [μου] ἀναπηδήσαντα τὸ
 9 φαλακρόν [μου] κατασκαριφᾶν καὶ κρώζειν περιβλέπουσαν. 'δοκῶ οὖν σε, D
 ὦ Πλάτων, πολλὰ κατὰ τῆς ἐμῆς ψεύσεσθαι κεφαλῆς.'

Ἦν δὲ ὁ Πλάτων πρὸς τῇ κακοηθείᾳ καὶ φιλόδοξος, ὅστις ἔφησεν ἔσχα-
 12 τον τὸν τῆς δόξης χιτῶνα ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτῷ ἀποδυνάμεθα, ἐν διαθήκαις,
 ἐν ἐκκομιδαῖς, ἐν τάφοις, ὥς φησι Διοσκόριδης ἐν τοῖς Ἀπομνη-
 μονεύμασιν. καὶ τὸ πόλιν δὲ θελῆσαι κτίσαι καὶ τὸ νομοθετῆσαι τίς οὐ
 15 φήσει πάθος εἶναι φιλοδοξίας; δῆλον δ' ἐστὶ τοῦτο ἐξ ὧν ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ

1 τρὶς εἰς Σικελίαν ἐκπλεύσας] Diog. Laert. III 18, VI 25, Apul. *de dogm.*
Plat. I 4, Philostr. *vit. Apoll. Tyan.* I 35, Max. Tyr. *Diss.* XXII 5, Tzetz. *Chil.*
 X 993, Suidas s. v. Πλάτων et Αἰσχίνης ῥυάκων χάριν] Diog. Laert. III
 18, Olymp. *vita Plat.* p. 3,7 ed. Didot, Anonymi *vita Plat.* p. 7,51 ed. Didot
 3 πένητος ὄντος Diog. Laert. II 61, Senec. *Benef.* I 8, cfr Zeller II: 1,4, p. 240 n. 5
 μαθητὴν ἓνα Diog. Laert. II 63 γνώριμος δ' αὐτοῦ φέρεται εἰς, Ἀριστο-
 τέλης ὁ Μῦθος ἐπικληθεὶς 4 Φαίδωνι cfr Cic. *nat. deor.* I 33,93 (fr. 235 Use-
 ner) *Phaedoni Socratico turpissime maledixerit* (sc. Epicurus) 11 Joh. Chrys.
hom. XVII in ep. ad Rom., PGM LX, p. 568 τὰ μὲν ἄλλα παθήματα καταλύεται
 τῷ θανάτῳ, ἡ δὲ κενοδοξία καὶ μετὰ τελευτὴν βιάζεται καὶ φιλονεικεῖ τὴν αὐτῆς
 ἐπιδεικνυσθαι φύσιν ἐν τῷ τεθνηκότι σώματι. ὅταν γὰρ σήματα λαμπρὰ καὶ πᾶσαν
 αὐτῶν ἀναλίσκοντα τὴν οὐσίαν ἐπισκῆπτωσι τελευτῶντες αὐτοῖς ἀνιστᾶν καὶ ἐν ταφῇ
 ἀσωτίαν πολλὴν σπουδάζωσι προαποτίθεσθαι (vanitatis exempla praebent), Olymp.
in Phaed. B 101 Norvin ἔσχατος χιτῶν ἡ φιλοτιμία, Euagr. *Hist. Eccl.*
 I 21, p. 31,6 Bidez-Parmentier οὕτω τὴν κενοδοξίαν καταπατοῦσιν, ὃν τελευταῖον
 χιτῶνα, κατὰ Πλάτωνα τὸν σοφόν, ἡ ψυχὴ πέφυκεν ἀποτίθεσθαι, Georg. Pisid.
de vanitate vitae, PGM XCII, 1598 ὥς οὐκ ἀκόμμως, ὥς δοκεῖ μοι, καὶ Πλάτων
 προσεμπεπάρθαι συγγράφει τῇ καρδίᾳ ὥς ἔσχατον χιτῶνα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Simplic.
in Epicet. 48 διὸ καὶ ἔσχατος λέγεται τῶν παθῶν χιτῶν ἡ φιλοδοξία, Tac.
Hist. IV 6, *etiam sapientibus cupido gloriae novissima exuitur* = Fronto p. 144
 Naber, Epicet. *Diss.* I c. 25 τὸ τελευταῖον χιτωνόριον ἐστὶ τὸ σωματίον
 13 FHG II 196

8 [μου] duplex, Kaibel 9 κρώζειν Hemsterhusius, Dobree : κρατεῖν A
 κράζειν Jacobs 10 ψεύδεσθαι A ψεύσασθαι E : corr. Schweighäuser
 12 δόξης AE : φιλοδοξίας Kaibel

507 E λέγει. 'πέπονθά τι πάθος πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ζωγράφος ἐβού-
λετο τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργα κινούμενα καὶ ἐνεργὰ ἰδεῖν, οὕτω καὶ γὰρ τοὺς πολίτας
οὕς διαγράφω.'

3

5. De scriptis et discipulis Platonis. ATHENAEVS XI 117—118,
p. 507 E—508 E.

XI 117 Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν τοῖς διαλόγοις αὐτοῦ λελεγμένων τί ἂν καὶ λέγοι τις; ἡ
μὲν γὰρ ψυχὴ ἡ διαπλαττομένη ἀθάνατος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀπόλυσιν
χωριζομένη τοῦ σώματος παρὰ πρῶτῳ εἴρηται Ὀμήρῳ. οὗτος γὰρ εἶπεν 6
ὥς ἡ τοῦ Πατρόκλου ψυχὴ

*Αἰδοσθε καθῆλθεν

ὃν πότμον γούωσα, λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.

9

εἰ δ' οὖν καὶ Πλάτωνος φήσειεν τις εἶναι τὸν λόγον, οὐχ ὁρῶ τίν' ἐσχέκαμεν
F ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ὀφέλειαν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ συγχωρήσῃ τις μεθίστασθαι τὰς τῶν
τετελευτηκότων ψυχὰς εἰς ἄλλας φύσεις καὶ πρὸς τὸν μετεωρότερον καὶ 12
καθαρώτερον τόπον, ἅτε κουφότητος μετεχούσας, τί πλέον ἡμῖν; ὦν γὰρ
μήτ' ἀνάμνησίς ἐστιν οὐ ποτε ἤμεν μήτ' αἰσθησις, εἰ καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἤμεν,
τίς χάρις ταύτης τῆς ἀθανασίας; 15

508 Οἱ δὲ συντεθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Νόμοι καὶ τούτων ἔτι πρότερον ἡ Πολιτεία
τί πεποιθήκασιν; καίτοι γε ἔδει καθάπερ τὸν Λυκοῦργον τοὺς Λακεδαιμονί-

1 Tim. 19 B, sed longe aliter Plato 5 Phaed. 64 E ἀπολύων... τὴν
ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σώματος κοινωνίας, cfr 67 A 6 Ὀμήρῳ] Heraclit.
quaest. Homer. c. 17 (Oelmann p. 26,5) πάλιν οὖν ὁ πρὸς Ὀμηρον ἀχάριστος ἐν
τῇ Πολιτείᾳ Πλάτων ἐλέγχεται διὰ τούτων τῶν ἐπῶν τὸ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δόγμα
νοσφισιάμενος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (varia afferuntur). ταῦτα τοίνυν ὥσπερ ἐκ πηγῆς τῶν
Ὀμηρικῶν ἐπῶν εἰς τοὺς ἰδίους διαλόγους ὁ Πλάτων μετ' ἡμῶν, [Long.] Περὶ
ὑψους 13,3 Πλάτων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ νάματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας παρατροπὰς ἀπο-
χετευσάμενος 9 Pl. II 856 ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ θεθῆων πταμένη Ἀιδόσδε
βεβήκειν ὃν πότμον γούωσα, λιποῦσα δροτῆτα (sic Clemm-Wackernagel) καὶ
ἥβην Theophil. episc. Antiochen. ad Autolyc. II, PGM 6,1120 B de immor-
talitate animae disserens hunc versum affert (βέβηκε) 11 μεθίστασθαι] Axiach.
372 ἡ ἐκ τοῦδε τοῦ χωρίου μετασταθεῖσα ψυχὴ 12 μετεωρότερον] Phaed. 109
DE καθαρώτερον] Theaet. 177 A ἐκεῖνος μὲν ὁ τῶν κακῶν καθαρὸς τόπος
17 Λυκοῦργον] cfr Joseph. c. Apion. II 225 Niese

4 λελεγμένων A om. E : κεκλεμμένων Kaibel 6 πρῶτῳ AE : προτέρῳ Kaibel
9 ἀδροτῆτα A sec. Casaubonum 12 καὶ primum AE : ἡ Wilamowitz

- ους καὶ τὸν Σόλωνα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ τὸν Ζάλευκον τοὺς Θουρίους, καὶ 508 A
αὐτόν, εἴπερ ἦσαν χρήσιμοι, πείσαι τινὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐτοῖς χρήσασθαι.
3 ὁ νόμος γάρ ἐστιν, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης, ὁ λόγος ὠρισμένος καθ'
ὁμολογίαν κοινὴν πόλεως, μηνύων πῶς δεῖ πράττειν ἕκαστα. ὁ δὲ Πλάτων
πῶς; οὐκ ἄτοπον τριῶν Ἀθηναίων γενομένων νομοθετῶν τῶν γε δὴ γνωρι-
6 ζομένων, Δράκοντος καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ Σόλωνος, τῶν μὲν τοῖς
νόμοις ἐμμένειν τοὺς πολίτας, τῶν δὲ τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ προσκαταγελᾶν; B
ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ περὶ τῆς Πολιτείας· εἰ καὶ πασῶν ἐστὶν αὕτη βελτίων,
9 μὴ πείθῃ δ' ἡμᾶς, τί πλέον; οἶκεν οὖν ὁ Πλάτων οὐ τοῖς οὖσιν ἀνθρώποις
γράφαι τοὺς νόμους, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διαπλαττομένοις, ὥστε καὶ ζητεῖ-
σθαι τοὺς χρησομένους. ἐχρῆν οὖν ἃ πείσει λέγων, ταῦτα καὶ γράφειν καὶ
12 μὴ ταῦτά ποιεῖν τοῖς εὐχομένοις, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἀντεχομένοις.
Χωρὶς τοίνυν τούτων εἴ τις διεξίει τοὺς Τιμαίους αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς Γοργίας XI 118
καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους δὲ τοὺς τοιούτους διαλόγους, ἐν οἷς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς C
15 μαθήμασι διεξέρχεται καὶ περὶ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν καὶ περὶ πλειόνων ἄλλων,
οὐδ' ὥς διὰ ταῦτα θαυμαστέος ἐστίν. ἔχει γάρ τις καὶ παρ' ἐτέρων ταῦτα
λαβεῖν ἢ βέλτιον λεχθέντα ἢ μὴ χεῖρον. καὶ γὰρ Θεόπομπος ὁ Χῖος
18 ἐν τῷ Κατὰ τῆς Πλάτωνος διατριβῆς ὅτις πολλοὺς, φησί, τῶν διαλόγων
αὐτοῦ ἀχρεῖους καὶ ψευδεῖς ἂν τις εὖροι ἄλλοτριους δὲ τοὺς πλείους, ὄντας
ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστίππου διατριβῶν, ἐπίους δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀντισθένης, πολλοὺς D
21 δὲ καὶ τῶν Βρύσσωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλεώτου.

3 Ἀριστοτέλης] *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1420 a 25 καὶ γὰρ ὁ νόμος ἐστὶν ὡς ἀπλῶς
εἰπεῖν λόγος κτλ 8 Πολιτείας] *Joh. Chrys. in Matth.* I 4, PGM LVII 18
Πλάτων ὁ τὴν καταγέλαστον ἐκείνην πολιτείαν συνθεῖς 10 διαπλαττομένοις]
Luc. Ver. hist. II 17 Πλάτων δὲ μόνος οὐ παρῆν, ἀλλ' ἐλέγετο καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ
ἀναπλασθείσῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πόλει οἰκεῖν χρώμενος τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τοῖς νόμοις οἷς συνέ-
γραψεν, cfr *Icaromenipp.* 781, *Liv.* XXVI 22,14 *si qua sit sapientium civitas,*
quam docti fingunt magis quam norunt, *Greg. Naz. contra Iul.* I 44, PGM XXXV
568 B τούτους, οἱ καὶ λόγῳ πλάττουσιν πόλεις τὰς ἐργῶ συστήναι μὴ δυναμένας καὶ
τὰς σεμνὰς τυραννίδας μονοῦ προσκυνούσι 15 μαθήμασι] cfr e. g. *Sext.*
Emp. adv. math. I p. 215 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλη καὶ
τοὺς ὁμοίους δυσμένειαν πολυμαθεῖς γεγονότας . . . ὁ Ἐπίκουρος . . . ἐγένετο τῶν
μαθημάτων κατήγορος. 17 Θεόπομπος] *Fr Gr Hist F* 259, *FHG* I 325
19 ψευδεῖς] *Origenes c. Cels.* II 12, PGM XI, 817 21 Βρύσσωνος] *Arist.*
hist. an. VI 5, *Plut. Romul.* 9, *FHG* II 27, *Suidas s. v.* Θεόδωρος, Σωκράτης, cfr
eclogam Ehippi infra, *Alex. Aphrod. in Aristot. metaphys.* I 9, p. 566 a 30 Br.

5 πῶς οὐκ ἄτοπος **AE** : corr. Kaibel 6 Δράκοντος καὶ Σόλωνος καὶ αὐτοῦ
τοῦ Πλάτωνος Meineke 7 αὐτοῦ Πλάτωνος **E** 8 ἐστὶν **AE** : εἴη Meineke
11 οὖν ἃ πείσει Musurus : οὐ ἄπεισι **A** οὖν οὐ εἰσο **E** λέγειν **E**
16 οὐδὲ διὰ ταῦτα **E**

508 D Ἀλλὰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἅπερ ἐπαγγέλλεται καὶ ἡμεῖς ζητοῦμεν ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνου λόγων, [ὅπερ] οὐχ εὐρίσκομεν, ἀλλὰ συμπόσια μὲν καὶ λόγους ὑπὲρ ἔρωτος εἰρημένους καὶ μάλα ἀπρεπεῖς, οὓς καταφρονῶν τῶν ἀναγνω- 3 σομένων συνέθηκεν, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ τυραννικοὶ τινες καὶ διάβολοι γενόμενοι.

XI 119 Εὐφραῖος μὲν γὰρ παρὰ Περδίκκα τῷ βασιλεῖ διατρίβων ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ 6 Ε οὐχ ἦτιον αὐτοῦ ἐβασίλευε, φαῦλος ὢν καὶ διάβολος, δς οὕτω ψυχρῶς συνέταξε τὴν ἐταιρίαν τοῦ βασιλέως ὥστε οὐκ ἐξῆν τοῦ συσσιτίου μετασχεῖν, εἰ μή τις ἐπίστατο γεωμετρεῖν ἢ φιλοσοφεῖν. ὅθεν Φιλίππου τὴν ἀρχὴν παρα- 9 λαβόντος Παρμενίων αὐτὸν ἐν Ὠρεῶν λαβὼν ἀπέκτεινεν, ὥς φησι Κ α ο ὕ σ τ ι ο ς ἐν Ἱστορικοῖς Ὑπομνήμασι.

Καὶ Κάλλιππος δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, μαθητὴς καὶ αὐτὸς Πλάτωνος, ἐταῖρος 12 F Δίωνος καὶ συμμαθητὴς γενόμενος καὶ συναποδημήσας αὐτῷ εἰς Συρακούσας, ὁρῶν ἤδη τὸν Δίωνα ἐξειδιοποιούμενον τὴν μοναρχίαν ἀποκτείνας αὐτὸν καὶ αὐτὸς τυραννεῖν ἐπιχειρήσας ἀπεσφάγη. 15

Εὐδαίμων δὲ ὁ Λαμψακηνός, ὥς φησιν Εὐρύπυλος καὶ Δ ι κ α ι ο κ λ ῆ ς ὁ Κνίδιος ἐνενηκοστῶ καὶ πρώτῳ Διατριβῶν, ἔτι δὲ Δ η μ ο χ ᾶ ρ η ς ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Σοφοκλέους πρὸς Φίλωνα, δανείσας τῇ πατρίδι ἀργύριον 18 ἐπὶ ἐνεχύρῳ τῇ ἀκροπόλει [καί] ἀφυστερησάσης τυραννεῖν ἐβούλετο, ἕως συνδραμόντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ Λαμψακηνοὶ καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἀποδόντες ἐξέβα- 21 λον.

509 A Τιμόλαος δ' ὁ Κυζικηνός, ὥς ὁ αὐτὸς Δ η μ ο χ ᾶ ρ η ς φησὶν, χρήματα καὶ οἶτον ἐπιδούς τοῖς πόλταις καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πιστευθεὶς εἶναι χρηστός παρὰ

4 Plut. *adv. Colot.* 32 p. 1126 C Πλάτων δὲ τῶν ἐταίρων ἐξαπέστειλεν Ἀρκάσι μὲν Ἀριστῶννον διακοσμήσοντα τὴν πολιτείαν, Ἡλείους δὲ Φορμίωνα, Μενέδημον δὲ Πυρραῖους κτλ. 6 Εὐφραῖος] *supra* p. 506 E, Plat. *ep.* 5, Demosth. IX 59, Suidas s. v. ex Harpocr. 10 FHG IV 357 12 Κάλλιππος... συναποδημήσας] Plut. *Dion.* 28 p. 970 C, 54 p. 981 E sqq, Diog. Laert. III 46, sed negat Plato, *ep.* VII 333 E 16 Εὐδαίμων] Diog. Laert. III 46 Δικαιοκλῆς] *cfr* Numen. *ap. Euseb. praep. ev.* XIV 731 C. 17 Δημοχάρης] *fr.* 1 Baiter-Sauppe 22 Τιμόλαος] *Acad. philos. index Herc. col.* VI 12, p. 35 Mekler, Diog. Laert III 46

2 [ὅπερ] Dobree 5 διάβολοι γεγόνασι E 6 εὐφρατος AE : corr. Casaubonus 7 ἐβασίλευε et δς del. Kaibel 8 ἐταίρων A : corr. E 15 ἀπεσφάγη E : ἐπεσφάγη A 16 Εὐδᾶγων AE : corr. e Diog. Laert. 17 ἐν ἐνεκοστῶ A ἐν εἰκοστῶ malim cum Musuro 19 καὶ ἀποστερήσας A καὶ ἀφυστερήσας E : corr. Casaubonus [καί] Wilamowitz 22 Τιμόλαος scripsi Τίμαιος codd.

τοῖς Κυζικηνοῖς, μικρὸν ἐπισχὼν χρόνον ἐπέθετο τῇ πολιτείᾳ δι' Ἀρριδαίου. 509 A
κριθεὶς δε καὶ ἀλούς καὶ ἀδοξήσας ἐν μὲν τῇ πόλει ἐπέμενε παλαιὸς καταγε-
3 γηρακῶς, ἀτίμως δὲ καὶ ἀδόξως διαζῶν.

Τοιοῦτοι δ' εἰσὶ καὶ νῦν τῶν Ἀκαδημαϊκῶν τινες, ἀνοσίως καὶ ἀδόξως
βιοῦντες. χρημάτων γὰρ ἐξ ἀσεβείας καὶ παρὰ φύσιν κυριεύσαντες διὰ
6 γοητείαν νῦν εἰσιν περίβλεπτοι, ὥσπερ καὶ Χαίρων ὁ Πελληνεύς, ὃς οὐ B
μόνον Πλότωνι ἐσχόλακεν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ξενοκράτει. καὶ οὗτος οὖν τῆς πατρί-
δος πικρῶς τυραννήσας οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν πολιτῶν ἐξήλασεν ἀλλὰ
9 καὶ τοῖς τούτων δούλοις τὰ χρήματα τῶν δεσποτῶν χαρισάμενος καὶ τὰς
ἐκείνων γυναικας συνώκισεν πρὸς γάμου κοινωνίαν, ταῦτ' ὠφελήθεις ἐκ
τῆς καλῆς Πολιτείας καὶ τῶν παρανόμων Νόμων.
12 Διὸ καὶ Ἐφίπιος ὁ κωμωδιοποιὸς ἐν Ναναγῶ Πλάτωνά τε αὐτὸν XI 120
καὶ τῶν γνωρίμων τινὰς κεκωμώδηκεν ὥς καὶ ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ συκοφαντοῦν- C
τας, ἐμφαίνων ὅτι καὶ πολυτελῶς ἡσκοῦντο καὶ ὅτι τῆς εὐμορφίας τῶν καθ'
15 ἡμᾶς ἀσελγῶν πλείονα πρόνοιαν ἐποιοῦντο· λέγει δ' οὕτως·

ἔπειτ' ἀναστὰς εὖστοχος νεανίας

τῶν ἐξ Ἀκαδημείας τις ὑπὸ Πλάτωνα καί

18 Βρυσωνοθρασυμαχειοληψικερμάτων,

πληγείς ἀνάγκη, ληπολιγομίσθῳ τέχνῃ

συνών τις, οὐκ ἄσκεπτα δυνάμενος λέγειν,

21 εὔ μὲν μαχαίρα ξύστ' ἔχων τριχώματα,

εὔ δ' ὑποκαθιείς ἄτομα πώγωνος βάθῃ,

εὔ δ' ἐν πεδίλῳ πόδα τιθεὶς ὑπὸ σφυρὸν

6 Χαίρων] Acad. philos. ind. Herc. col. XI 7, p. 29 Mekler
fr. II 257 Kock

12 Ephippi

1 Ἀριδαίου codd. : correxi

AE fort. πλούσιος Kaibel
καταστάς A : corr. Iacobs

firmat Alexis fr. 93

A : corr. Meineke -ληψικερμάτων Bergk

ληπιολογομίσθῳ Meineke

πόδα Scaliger: πολλὰ A

σφύρων) κνήμης Kaibel

2 καὶ ἀδοξήσας del. Wilamowitz

καὶ γεγηρακῶς AE : corr. Kaibel

17 Ἀκαδημείας codd. : -είας scribendum esse con-

firmat Alexis fr. 93 ὑποπλατωνικῶν Wilamowitz

19 ληπιολογομίσθῳ A : corr. Hemsterhous

22 ὑποκαθιείσα τομα A : corr. Scaliger

ξυρὸν A : σφυρὸν Casaubonus ἐπισφύρων (vel περι-

παλαιὸς

16 ἐπει

18 βρύσων ὁ θρασ.

23

509 D

δήσας ἰμάντας ἰσομέτροις ἐλίγμασιν,
 ὄγκῳ τε χλανίδος ἐδ' τεθωρακισμένος,
 σχῆμ' ἀξιώχρεων ἐπικαθεὶς βακτηρίᾳ,
 ἀλλότριον, οὐκ οἰκεῖον, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,
 ἔλεξεν ἄνδρες τῆς Ἀθηναίων χθονός.³

E

ι δήσας scripsi : κνήμης codd.
 Kaibel ἱματίων codd. sec. Casaubonum

ἰμάντας scripsi : ἱμάντων codd. sec.

COMMENTARY

1. *The Soldiership of Socrates.*

τοιούτοι εἶσι] We find the same demagogic mode of expression **V 55, 215 C** 220 E τούτοις γὰρ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν and 509 A τοιούτοι δ' εἰσὶ καὶ νῦν. No doubt these phrases were directly culled from the famous speech of Demochares in the spring of 306. The words of Demochares may have run thus: ἀλλ' οὐτ' ἐκ θύμβρας λόγῃ, οὐτ' ἐκ τοιούτων λόγων ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται.

The distinguished dinner-guests have been discussing φιλόδειπνοι βασιλεῖς (211 A) and are just listening to a learned discourse on the Peripatetic Athenion and his political adventures at Athens,¹ and the Epicurean Lysias of Tarsus (215 B). Thus, these words are pronounced as a definite opinion upon the doings and dealings of these men and, at the same time, as a sort of transition to the next person dealt with, Socrates.

We meet the same subject-matter Ael. *Var. Hist.* VII 14. It is probable that this material was put together by Hermippus in his work entitled *Περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς ἀριστείας καὶ δυναστείας μεθεστηκότων*. Aelian's *Var. hist.* III 17 ἐπολιτεύσαντο οὖν καὶ φιλόσοφοι has handed down to us another extract of a similar kind, beginning with Zaleucus and ending with Carneades and Critolaus (Herodicus' time). Primarily the question was raised in the dispute between the Epicurean Colotes and the contemporary Academic philosophers. In his answer *Πρὸς Κολώτην* Plutarch bears testimony to the fact that many of the old philosophers and their followers were good soldiers² and successful political leaders.

τρεῖς στρατείας] The tradition about Socrates' three military expeditions can be traced throughout the whole ancient literature. We can follow the theme in its different stages of evolution.

¹ Wilamowitz, Athenion u. Aristion, *SbAkBerlin* 1923, p. 39—50.

² *adv. Coloten* 1126 C, cfr 1117 E.

215 C I. Potidaea 432/31.

- 1) P l a t o mentions the matter in the following passages:
Apol. 28 E καὶ ἐν Ποτιδαίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει καὶ ἐπὶ Δηλίῳ.
Charm. 153 A—D. Socrates returns from Potidaea, only this sole fact is recorded (παραγεγόμενος), no details.
Symp. 219 E—220 E συνεσιτοῦμεν ἐκεῖ (at Potidaea), Alcibiades confesses that he was rescued by Socrates, it is he who really has deserved the meed of valour, the ἀριστεῖα. Plato's version of Alcibiades' ἀριστεῖα is supported by Isocrates' *Περὶ ξεύγους* 29—30.
- 2) A n t i s t h e n e s has, it would seem (216 C κἀν), added, that Socrates won the ἀριστεῖα also in the battle of Delium. This has later been misinterpreted so as to imply that Socrates won the ἀριστεῖα only in the battle of Delium. Further Antisthenes has added the story of how Socrates was warned in the battle by his δαιμόνιον, a favourite subject of Antisthenes. The romantic story in the first Socratic letter may thus be traced back to a dialogue by Antisthenes, probably the *Alcibiades*.¹ It is well known that the Socratic tradition contains several similar double versions, which as a rule can ultimately be traced back to the different treatment of the subject in Plato and Antisthenes. Diog. Laert. III 8 justifies the supposition that Aristoxenus has also contributed to a sort of literary embellishment of the story.
- 3) P l u t a r c h, in his account in the *Life of Alcibiades* ch. 7, has not added any new facts to Plato's version. It seems to me that Dittmar² has made too much fuss about the fact that Plato uses the word σύσκηνος instead of συνεσιτοῦμεν, and the addition that Socrates gave up the ἀριστεῖα, βουλόμενος αὔξεσθαι τὸ φιλότιμον ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς αὐτοῦ, is quite typical of Plutarch's ever-moralizing way of inventing motives. Of Dittmar's supposed »gelehrte Urvita» I can absolutely find no trace in Plutarch's account. The story of Socrates' con-

¹ Hirzel, *Der Dialog* I 125 thinks of the *Archelaos*, to which Köhler in her edition (Philol. Supplb. XX: 2, 1928) agrees, Dittmar more probably of the *Alcibiades*, (*Aeschines* p. 84).

² *Aeschines* p. 86.

duct at Delium is, in view of Plutarch's usual methods, an **215 C** exceptionally true version of *Symp.* 221 BC.

- 4) Diogenes in his account II 23, agrees with Plato, but talking of Potidaea he adds from Thucydides I 61,1 *ἐστρατεύσατο διὰ θαλάσσης*.¹ Wilamowitz took this to be the remains of a polemic against somebody having alleged that Socrates took the way through Thessalia. Wilamowitz is hardly right, in fact he shows the compiler too great an honour. These authors go to their work with a few facts picked up from well-known sources, in this case Plato and Antisthenes mingled with the relation of Thucydides. The further development depends on what final end they have in mind, whether they want to use the material to make a belletristic work, a biographic compilation or a speech; there is the tradition and there is the design. The story of how Socrates was found standing, lost in thought, during a whole night, is quoted everywhere.²

- 5) When the subject is alluded to by other authors, the dominating trait is: Socrates frightens the enemies by his manly demeanour. So in

Aelian. *Var. hist.* VII 14

Themist. *or.* XXIII p. 298 A

Ael. Aristid. *or.* *Πρὸς Πλάτωνα* I 120, *Πρὸς Πλ.* ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων p. 324

Libanius *decl. I apol. Socr.* V p. 87 Foerster, *decl. II de Socr. silentio*, V p. 139

Joh. Chrys. *ἐρμηνεία εἰς τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν* II 5, *PGM* LVI, 33

¹ Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 40 (1905) p. 146: »In der Sokratesvita des Diogenes II 23 steht eine seltsame Notiz *ἐστρατεύσατο διὰ θαλάσσης*. Dass kann nur Polemik gegen jemanden sein der ihn durch Thessalien gehen liess. Der Dialog *Sisyphos* führt wirklich den Sokrates in Pharsalos ein: man sieht nun, wie das mit der Sokratesvita ausgeglichen und diese Ausgleichung widerlegt wird. Dem Verfasser des *Sisyphos* tat man mit beiden zu grosser Ehre an.» Really too sophisticated.

² Gellius *Noct. Att.* II 1 exaggerates, *stare solitus*, and Strabo XV 1, 60 shows that the orientalizing influence of the time of Aristoxenus accounts for the spread of this story.

215 C II. Delium 424/23.

Herodicus means that, if Socrates took part at all in the battle of Delium, which he doubts, he fled ἀσχημόνως like all the other Athenians. But only on one point do all our sources agree: the Athenians ran away, but Socrates did not run away headlong, but in a cautious and dignified manner. The ἀσχημόνως of Herodicus is thus his private calumnia.

- 1) The assertion of Antisthenes-Aristoxenus¹ to the effect that Socrates won the ἀριστεία at Delium is repeated by Simplicius *ad cap.* 31 *Epicteti*: καὶ μὲν γὰρ Σωκράτης ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ Δηλίου μάχῃ τὰ ἀριστεία ἔλαβε καὶ διὰ τῶν πολεμίων ἀναχωροῦντι μόνῳ φασιν οὐδείς ἐτόλμησεν ἐπελθεῖν πάντων τοῦ ἀνδρός καταπλαγέντων τὸ φρόνημα. Thus it must have been known and spoken of somewhere in the anecdotal literature. I suppose Simplicius had his information from the *History of Philosophy* by Porphyrius; consequently its origin would be Aristoxenean.
- 2) Cicero *de div.* I 54 tells us, from Antipater according to his own statement, how Socrates is kept by his δαιμόνιον from taking the same road as the other citizens trying to save themselves by flight. These were killed, says Plutarch,² but Socrates, Alcibiades and Laches were rescued thanks to the warning of the δαιμόνιον. In novelistic form the same story recurs *Epist. Socr.* I 9 and the ultimate source is, as has been previously observed, Antisthenes.³
- 3) Exaggerated and interpreted *in malam partem* the same story is told by Lucian in *Ver. hist.* II 23 and *Paras.* c. 43; an indignant scholiast cries out in disgust at the malignant distortion μὴ συνοφάντει, κατάρατε, οὐχ οὕτω ἀλλ' ἀριστεύων διετέλει, which proves how well-known the story was. That Socrates fled straight from Delion to the palaestra, is an invention by Lucian, brought about by a commingling of the version of *Symposion* and that of *Laches*, quite similar to the conta-

¹ Diog. Laert. III 8, Hirzel, *Der Dialog* I 190.

² *De genio Socratis* 581 E, see Volquardsen, *Das Daimonium des S. u. seine Interpretation*, p. 41. It seems probable that Plutarch and Cicero used the same source viz. the *Περὶ Μαντικῆς* by Antipater of Tarsus, the Stoic philosopher and teacher of Panaetius.

³ Hirzel, *Der Dialog* I 190.

mination discussed below, where Xenophon was introduced. 215 C This is another typical example of the work done by these story-tellers.

- 4) In Strabo IX 2,7 is added the story of how Socrates rescued Xenophon at Delion, recurring in Diog. Laert. II 23, *Ξενοφῶντα ἀφ' ἱππου πεσόντα*. That this is a simple addition, a new store added to the old house, is clearly shown by the verbal congruence in the other details: *πάντων φευγόντων Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸς ἀνεχώρησε*. Xenophon was the favourite of the Atticistic age; this explains the addition. Compare how in Plato's original version Socrates rescued Alcibiades at Potidaea — it is not mentioned exactly how he managed to do it. At Delium Alcibiades passes by on horseback, covering the retreat of Socrates and Laches. These are the two original elements in this late contamination. Xenophon himself talks of the defeat at Delium *Mem.* III 5,4, yet without mentioning himself or Socrates.

III. Amphipolis.

It is very significant that tradition in this case is very meagre. In Plato just one bare fact has been discovered. Later compilers probably found no parallel tradition from Antisthenes. Consequently later tradition knows no more than Plato: Diog. Laert. III 22, Lucian *Paras.* c. 43, Aelian. *Var. hist.* VII 14, Aristides *or. ὑπέρ τ. τετάρων* 324, Libanius *decl. I apol. Socr.* V p. 87 Foerster.

It is in my opinion a rather convincing argument, that this complex of tradition about the soldiership of Socrates as a whole is to be regarded as a rearrangement of the few primary sources we ourselves still possess, namely Plato (the pure facts), Thucydides (*ὁὐ πεζῇ, διὰ θαλάσσης*) and Isocrates (*πανοπλίαν*); the seemingly new features are pure inventions of a tendentious or novelistic kind.

I have gone into this matter at some length, because the treatment of this subject »Socrates the soldier» is very typical of the sort of literature we are dealing with in this book. So I am anxious at once to let the church be where all can see it, and so reduce the various versions to their real value. In this literature the fourth century sources are the most important ones — they are surveyed in the last chapter of this book — and hints and allusions in the

215 C works of Plato and his contemporaries have been carefully collected, studied, commented on and taken as a starting-point for various slanderous allegations.

215 E *παρενέχρωσε*] *παρεγγχρώννυμι* is used only here, yet Kaibel's suggestion *παρεγκρούειν* is not better, as this word occurs nowhere. There are many verbs composed of *χρώζω* (later *χρώννυμι*), *χρώζω* or *χροῖζω*, all implying »an easy touch«, especially with reference to the surface of something. In this connection *παρενέχρωσε* is a very choice expression.

F *ὥς Ἡρόδικος*] belongs of course to the whole sentence and not to the protasis only.

216 B *κεκοινωνηκότι*] Authors of the Herodicean stamp always proceed in this manner: first they paint the devil on the wall, then they make a violent assault. Of course Plato has never alleged that Socrates won the *ἀριστεῖα* at Delium. On the contrary Alcibiades says 221 A, that he helped Socrates during the flight.

Κρίτωνι] Herodicus leaves out some important words: *εἰ μὴ ποτε στρατευσόμενος*. Schmidt remarks:¹ »Haec ultima verba utrum in suo exemplo non invenerit Herodicus, an memoriae deceptus neglexerit, altioris est indaginis.« This is really a far too benevolent comment; the words are of course consciously omitted.

2. *Anachronisms.*

V 56—59 In order to understand the anachronisms in Plato's dialogues we must know the contemporary point of view in this respect.²

Historical tradition was mainly oral³ and vague. There was no distinction felt between history and myth. The famous orators did

¹ *De Herodico Crateteo* p. VII.

² See A. Roemer, *Über den liter.-aestet. Bildungsstand d. att. Theaterpublikums*, Abh. d. Bay. Ak. 22 (1901), München 1905.

³ Thuc. I 20 *οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων . . . δέχονται*, cfr Burckhardt III 428, or p. 640 in the abridged edition of 1934.

not hesitate to serve up the most astonishing stories.¹ Of course they often had a certain purpose, of course there was sometimes a vast ignorance of elementary chronological facts, but the important fact is that people did not generally feel this lack of knowledge.

The anachronisms of Plato² are comparatively few and a matter of secondary importance, as it is not at all his purpose to write history. Where, as in the *Protagoras*, he has clearly committed a number of chronological errors, he has done so in order to create an interesting, artistic background for the discussion supposed to have taken place in the house of Callias. This house was by far the best possible meeting place, Socrates had to be described as a young man listening to the »wise« old sophists, Alcibiades and Critias could not easily be represented as partaking in such a conversation after the peace of Nicias; it must be before the war. In the *Parmenides* the whole mise-en-scène is so openly and purely imaginary that in this dialogue nobody would really think of chronological questions — none but our Herodicus.³

Herodicus certainly did his best to unmask Plato. And here is a summary of his chronological inquiries.⁴

- | | | | |
|--------|---------|------------|---|
| 432/31 | ol.87/1 | Pythodoros | 234 F. Potidaea προτερεῖ τῆς ἐπὶ Δῆλιον μάχης 216 C. Probably Plato has thought of this year for his Protagoras. Kirchner, <i>Prosop. Att.</i> 12389. |
| 431/30 | 2 | Euthydemos | 217 A. Kirchner 5515. The war begins. |

¹ Examples from Isocrates, Wilamowitz *Hermes* 25 (1890) p. 181, Lysias VI 10 about Pericles; Andocides I 107 makes a muddle of the battles of Marathon and Salamis and the expeditions of Datis and Xerxes; Lycurgus *Leocr.* 70 makes a lot of mistakes — not to speak of the γένος δικανικόν.

² Treated by E. Zeller, *Über Anachronismen in den platon. Gesprächen*, Abh. Ak. Berlin 1873, p. 80.

³ Casaubonus remarks mildly: riserit fortasse divinus Plato laboriosiorum hominum conatus ad tam subtilem trutinam fictiones ipsius exigentium. Schweigh. III 2, p. 239.

⁴ These chapters are treated by V. Contareni, *Variarum lectionum liber*, Trajecti ad Rh., 1754, c. 13 *Plato in Protagora ab Athenaei calumnia vindicatus*; by Schweighäuser in his commentary and by Kroschel, *De temporibus rerum quae in Platonis Protagora habentur*, Erfurt 1859. Various later scholars have discussed details in this essay of Herodicus.

V 56—59	430/29	3	Apollodoros	217 A. Plato was born, 217 B. K. 1375.
	429/28	4	Epameinon	(This is the correct form, see Jac. Apollodor. 306, Zeller II 1 ⁴ , p. 390, 1; Epameinondas according to Diod. XII 46, <i>Πλάτων δὲ ἐπ' Ἀμεινίου γέγονεν</i> DL III 3, the <i>argumentum Eurip. Hippol.</i> has Ἀμείωνος.) Pericles dies, 217 E. According to Neanthes Plato was born this year. Kirchner 4758.
	428/27	ol.88/1	Diotimos	Not mentioned by Herodicus. According to the most trustworthy tradition (Apollodorus), Plato was born in the first half of the year 427. Kirchn. 4366.
	427/26	2	Eukleides	(or Eukles), not mentioned by Herodicus. Kirchner 5709.
	426/25	3	Euthydemos	(or Euthynos). Hipponicus under Nicias πρὸς Ταναγραίονος 218 B, compare Thuc. III 91. Kirchner 5655.
	425/24	4	Stratokles	Not mentioned by Herodicus. Kirchner 12927.
	424/23	ol.89/1	Isarchos	Amipsias produces the <i>Κόννος</i> , in which Protagoras is not mentioned ἐν τῷ τῶν φροντιστῶν χορῷ, 218 C. Delion, where Socrates rescues Alcibiades. Armistice, αἱ ἐνιαύσιαι σπονδαί, 218 C. Ἐχεχειρία ἐνιαύσιος Thuc. IV 117. Hipponicus killed at Delion, Andoc. c. <i>Alc.</i> 13. Kirchner 7685.
	423/22	2	Ameinias	218 D. Kirchner 670.
	422/21	3	Alkaios	Amphipolis, 215 D, 218 DE. Hipponicus is killed shortly before, and Eupolis produces the <i>Κόλακες</i> , in which play Callias is said to have inherited his father, 218 B. Protagoras is in Athens for the second time, between Isarchus and Alcaeus, i. e. at least this year, 218 B. Peace for 50 years, Thuc. V 25, Iustin. III, 7, 13. Kirchner 572.

421/20	4 Aristion	The pancration-victory of Autolycus is celebrated by Callias ¹ , Xenophon's <i>Banquet</i> , Eupolis produces the <i>Αὐτόλυκος</i> , 216 D. Pherecrates produces his <i>Ἀγριοί</i> , 218 D, at the Lenaea 420. Thuc. V 35, <i>ἐπιμειξίαι</i> . Kirchner 1732.
420/19 01.90/1	Astyphilos	218 DE. Plato's dialogue <i>Protagoras</i> is supposed to have taken place, if we take into consideration the production of the <i>Ἀγριοί</i> , 218 CD. At this time it was possible for Hippias to stay in Athens, 218 C, as the city had entered into an alliance with the Eleans, Thuc. V 47. Kirchner 2661.
419/18	2 Archias	} Not mentioned by Herodicus. Kirchner 2445, 1277.
	3 Antiphon	
417/16	4 Euphemos	217 A. Agathon's victory, Plato's <i>Banquet</i> , Plato 14 years old, 216 F, compare Diod. XII 81. Kirchner 6034.

ἴσως μὴδὲ γεννηθέντα] Unfortunately, this passage has played an **216 D** important part in the discussion of Xenophon's birth-year. *Anab.* III 1,25 ἀκμάζειν ἡγοῦμαι does not say much, III 2,37 is only a comparison with the *πρεσβύτατοι στρατηγοί*; it is to be observed that the Greek language has no proper word for »middle-aged» besides ἀκμάζειν. III 4,42, too, has only relative importance. To take VI 4,25 and VII 3,46 as an argument that Xenophon was himself only 30 years old, is obviously not correct; he chooses the young, strong warriors for especially dangerous expeditions, but there is no word of his own age. The statement that he was rescued at Delium, on which fact Diogenes Laertius apparently based his ἀκμή, is, as has been shown above, a late addition. The fact that he died about 355 at an advanced age, 90 years old according to ps.-Lucian. *Μακρόβιοι*, proves that he was born in the year 440 or so, which

¹ According to Xen. *Conv.* I 2 Autolycus won this victory at the Great Panathenaea, which were celebrated in the first month every third year of the Olympiad: this festival, then, ought to have taken place the preceding year. Cfr Hermann, *De tempore convivii Xenophonte*, P. Gött. 1844, p. 3, n. 2.

tallies very well with the passages in the *Anabasis*, where his ἀκμή is mentioned.

Herodicus' statement is as usual partly true — Xenophon could not have been more than about 17 years old at the time at which he supposed his banquet to have taken place; but there are other more important reasons to assume that his παραγεγόμενος is pure fiction.¹

- 216 E** πάλιν ὁ Ξεν.] Xenophon always uses a particle, as in *Cyrif.* III 1, 18. Aristotle has both πάλιν δέ (e. g. *Rep.* IV 3, 12, 1291 a 14) and πάλιν καί (*de part. an.* III 1, 662 a 12, cfr 656 b 18). Later on πάλιν was used, just as we in the writings of Xenophon see ἐνταῦθα and ἐντεῦθεν without particles, especially so by Plutarch (e. g. *de aud. poetis* 33 A, 54 E, *de vit. pud.* 533 B).

Πανσανίας] In Plato's *Banquet* it is Phaedrus who speaks about στρατόπεδον ἑρασιῶν τε καὶ παιδικῶν 178 E, in Xenophon's record it is Pausanias, quoted by Socrates. But in Plato also Pausanias touches upon the same subject with exactly the same examples, Thebes and Elis, 182 A. As to the subject-matter there is no difference at all between the two versions. Xenophon, whose work I regard as of later date, has simplified the story. Joel assumes on good reasons that Antisthenes² is the source of both narrations, and the testimonia show that it is a very popular subject. It is unnecessary to point out that the Sacred Band of Pelopidas³ increased the popularity of this theme.

- 217 A** τερατῶδες] repeated from 215 F, cfr 221 A. This word and τερατεία are very commonly used in a bad sense of philosophers.

- A B** λῆρός ἐστι τὸ Συμπόσιον] Also Aristides in the extract below uses the word ληρεῖν. I have inserted this passage from Aristides here, although I do not think that Aristides has preserved throughout the original wording of Herodicus. Yet it seems to me quite evident that the primary source of these chronological remarks on the Sym-

¹ See G. Rudberg, *Sokrates bei Xenophon*, Uppsala Univ. Årsskrift 1939: 2, p. 13.

² See the sound judgement of Geffcken, *Griech. Lit.-Gesch.* II 99 with note 64, and the literature in Christ-Schmid I⁶ 512, n. 8.

³ λερὸς λόγος, Plutarch. *Pelop.* c. 19.

posion and the *Menexenus* (inserted below 218 E) must be the treatise of Herodicus. In both extracts we can recognize his malignant accents: (*Symposion*) εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἐν τῷ Ἑλυσίῳ πεδίῳ¹ τὸ συμπόσιον συνεκροτεῖτο², (*Menexenus*) οὐδ' ἂν τὸ δαιμόνιον προύλεγεν αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων.

As to the chronology of the *Menexenus* and the *Symposion* I refer to Praechter's *Die Philosophie des Altertums*¹², p. 201—202, where the suggestion of Wilamowitz regarding the διοικισμός, *Platon* II² 177, is discussed and other literature recorded. Herodicus' observation is in this case quite correct. The διοικισμός Ἀρχάδων took place in 385/4; before this year Plato cannot have finished the *Symposion*. Ael. Aristides
II 371

If Herodicus' essay was not the source of Aristides, where then did he get his chronological data? If these archonts were mentioned by Xenophon, whose works are freely used by Aristides, he could have collected his material there. As this is not the case, Haas³ suggests that Aristides took over the chronological data from the Ἀτθίς by Androtion and then composed these chronological remarks himself. This is, however, not very likely. There is perhaps a quotation from Androtion's work in Aristides II 311, but as already Siebel has pointed out, there is probably something wrong about the name: this is presumably a passage from the Ἀτθίς by Andron.⁴ Further it seems to me rather incredible that Aristides, who is always very dependent on his sources and whose own contributions are as a rule limited to rhetorical outbursts and declamations, should be the author of these weighty notes, so rich of information.

In my opinion, Aristides has taken over these remarks, originating in the essay of Herodicus, from some contemporary compilation; perhaps he drew upon some scholia to Plato's dialogues. His own additional rhetoric is manifest in the concluding remarks ποῦ σύ τοῦτ' ἐτήρησας κτλ.

¹ Cfr Lucian. *Ver. hist.* II 17.

² Herodicus uses this word also 182 A συνεκρότῃται τὰ σώφρονα συμπόσια, although this is no decisive argument.

³ A. Haas, *Quibus fontibus Ael. Aristides in componenda decl. quae inscr. Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων usus sit.* D. Greifswald 1884, p. 33.

⁴ See FHG I 375 and Wellmann RE I 2160.

- 217 C** ἀκαιρίμαν] It is obvious that Strabo (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν συγγραφέων τῶν ταῦτά θρυλούντων I 2, 14) and Lucian (ἐπὶ τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν βιβλίων σεμνυνόμενοι *hist. conscr.* 32) used the same anthology.

ἀκαίρως] It is true that Alcidas wrote περὶ τῶν τοὺς γραπτὸς λόγους γραφόντων. But ἄγραφος in the meaning of »ex tempore, from memory« is very late (Procl. in *Parm.* p. 553 S.) On the contrary the reading ἀκαίρως gives the whole phrase its meaning: Herodicus wants to lay stress on the fact that Plato's chronological errors were no mere blunders. Moreover the rhetorical point in ἀκαιρίμαν — ἀκαίρως is lost, if we read ἀγράφως. For the rest the text is in good order, and I cannot see that Kaibel is right when he as usual suspects his pretended epitomist for having shortened and spoilt the text.

ἐητώς] Of course it is Herodicus who links these two quite disparate passages together.

- E** Ἐπαμείνωνος ἐφ' οὗ] Archelaus succeeded his father Perdiccas in 413¹ and was murdered in 399, whilst Pericles died in 429. Something, therefore, must have fallen out after Ἐπαμείνωνος. Casaubon's suggestion is not good. I should prefer something like this: <ἀφ' οὗ ἐκκαίδεκάτος ἐστὶν ἀρχὸν Κλείταρχος> ἐφ' οὗ. The lacuna might perhaps be explained by the homoearchon ἀφ' οὗ — ἐφ' οὗ. Yet it is rather uncertain if Herodicus has mentioned exactly this archon.

- F** διαφητισμός] More details in Xen. *Mem.* I 1, 18, *Hell.* I 7, 15 and 25, *Axioch.* 368 E. The material is used in the Peripatetic biographic literature: Diog. Laert. II 24, Ael. *Var. hist.* III 17 and by Libanius, see Markowski, *De Libanio Socratis defensore*, Breslauer Phil. Abh. 40 (1910) p. 69 with further references.

Somebody has afterwards added a few words in defence of Socrates²: τοῦτο (typical addition!) ὁ Σωκράτης . . . πάντα ποιήσεν. It is incredible that Athenaeus himself should have been able to insert this, as it does not agree with the general tendency of his work,

¹ See Gutschmid, *Kl. Schriften* IV 138.

² This, I suppose, is the reason why C. F. Wegener, *De aula Attolica*, Hauniae 1836, p. 156 presents Herodicus as »defensor Socratis«.

neither do we recognize his particularly affected and ornate language. I suppose the words were added by Phavorinus, as will be shown at some length in the sequel.

ἐν τῷ Πρωταγόρῳ] συμπαραεῖναι with the dative only, in the meaning 218 C »come to help», Xen. *Hell.* IV 6, 1, *alias*.

τοῦ Ἐλαφβολιῶνος] I have not found another example of the name of a month with the article unless μηνός is added.

The armistice was concluded ἄμα ἤρῃ 423, Thuc. IV 117, and came into force at once, IV 118, probably in the month of Ἐλαφβολιῶν (April).

ὁ δὲ τὸν διάλογον] The text is corrupt. Plato speaks of the Eleans D coming to Athens in the company of Protagoras, and this was impossible unless the one-year armistice was in force, says Herodicus, i. e. 423. If Plato then assigned (ὑφίσταται) his dialogue to this year, which, according to Herodicus, he must have done if he could have an Elean staying in Athens, his statement πέρυσσι is false, because the Ἄγριοι were produced in 420. If, on the other hand, we accept πέρυσσι, well, then we have to read οὐχ ὑφίσταται τὸν διάλογον γεγόμενον (viz. at the time of the armistice). To understand the words παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν it is necessary to substitute a negative.

Herodicus' argumentation is however erroneous. The Eleans did not, as a matter of fact, take part in the 50 years' peace, but the state of war was probably only a formality, and according to Thucydides V 35 ἐπιμειξίαι ἦσαν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Πελοποννησίοις even before the Eleans concluded the 100 years' treaty with Athens in 419, Thuc. V 47. All references except this allusion to the Ἄγριοι, show that Plato was thinking of the years immediately before the Peloponnesian war. Protagoras' first visit to Athens was in the year 444/3, when Pericles asked him to write a constitution for the city of Thurii, Diog. Laert. IX 50.

μή] may be explained as hypothetic = εἰ μή ἔμενεν ἡ ἐχεχειρία, E πολέμιοι ἂν ἦσαν (Kühner-Gerth II: 2, p. 201, n. 3), but we find μή συμφωνῶν 218 E and μή διακρίνας 217 C. The negative force of μή was felt stronger and the use of it increases already in Hellenistic Greek.

Ael. Aristides The *Menexenus*, it will be remembered, is a parody of the annual funeral orations in Athens, in which, as Socrates remarks 234 C καὶ τὰ προσόντα καὶ τὰ μὴ περὶ ἐκάστου ἔλεγον. Chronological facts are consciously quite neglected; Aspasia and Socrates discuss the happenings of the year 387. Historical events are manifestly distorted and misinterpreted.¹

II 370

The »great»² battle of Corinth was fought in the summer of 394, the year of Eubulides according to Diod. XIV 85. The »battle» of Lechaeon, the port of Corinth, which ended in a total defeat for the Athenians and their allies, took place in spring 391. But Plato only speaks of the »treachery» of Lechaeon; he probably thought of the events told by Xenophon *Hell.* IV 4,7 ff., when Praxitas defeated the Athenians. Thus Herodicus is quite right when he assigns these events to the year 394—93, when Eubulides was archon. Including Laches, archon 400/399, Eubulides is the seventh archon, and including Eubulides, archon 394/93, Theodotus is the eighth archon. In this year, 387/86, the peace of Antalcidas was concluded. The *Menexenus* is of course written some time later.

3. The pretended jealousy between Plato and Xenophon.

One of the learned dinner-guests has asked for a larger goblet, and after some erudite remarks on the word κρατήρ Pontianus quotes a speech by Socrates from Xenophon's *Banquet*, ch. II 24—27, telling how Philippos, after having finished an ample dessert asks for a μεγάλη φιάλη (this word has previously been discussed Ath. p. 504), whilst Socrates advises him rather to drink several small cups of wine. The chain of association is the usual one in Athenaeus, i. e. a mechanical arrangement of loosely connected catch-words and quotations: 1) different kinds of wine-cups, 2) φιάλη, 3) the passage from Xenophon, 4) the ζηλοτυπία.

504 E τοῦ καλοῦ Ξενοφῶντος] Here is a sure sign of Athenaeus' workmanship. Even Herodotus and Thucydides use λαμπρός of persons, but of course in the form ἀνὴρ ἐὼν λαμπρότατος (VII 154) or λαμπροτάτους γενομένους (I 138). In Plato the type Ἰππίας ὁ

¹ See Wendland, *Die Tendenz des Platonischen Menexenus*, Hermes 25 (1890), p. 183.

² Demosth. *Lept.* 52.

σοφός and Ἰσοκράτης ὁ καλός is very common. In the first century 504 E A. D. the method of sandwiching the adjective begins, simply in order to add colour to the style, and we get these vile ὁ χαρίεις Ἀγάθων, ὁ ἱερώτατος Ἱπποκράτης, ὁ μελιχρὸς Ἀναχρέων, ὁ γραμματικώτατος Ἀρίσταρχος, ὁ μουσικώτατος Ξενοφῶν and so on. From this use was developed the manner of referring to a well-known writer or philosopher as ὁ θεῖος (Homer), ὁ σοφός (Plato), cfr 507 A, a mark of honour nowadays reserved chiefly for film-stars.

ζηλοτυπία] The story of Plato's and Xenophon's jealousy is a product of the peripatetic biography¹ deficient of real back-ground. Of course they were quite different sort of men, but probably they did not even meet, certainly not after the expedition to Asia. The following points of concordance or discordance are usually referred to.

- 1) They both wrote Symposia and Apologies. There is of course, as Rudberg² has shown, a slight trace of controversy in these writings. It is by the way rather surprising that Herodicus did not make use of the passage in the *Protagoras* 347 CD, interpreting it as a criticism of Xenophon. The fact that Xenophon's *Banquet* was written after the *Protagoras* would surely not have hindered him.
- 2) In the case of the *στράτευμα ἐρασιῶν* Xen. VIII 32 and Plato 178 E and 182 A there is no difference of matter, as has been shown previously, only the parts are distributed in a different way.
- 3) They have different views on Ἀφροδίτη οὐράνια and πάνδημος (Xen. VIII 9), as Gellius XV 2 = Macrob. II 8 point out³, but there is no polemic.
- 4) In the *Phaedo* Plato does not include Xenophon among those present — but how could Xenophon have been present? From Asia he did not at all return to Athens. Xenophon is, as a matter of fact, not at all mentioned by Plato; the scholiast who comments on *Alc.* I 123⁴ is wrong. Xenophon did not go *παρὰ*

¹ A. Boeckh. *De similitudine quae inter Platonem et Xenophontem intercessisse fertur*, Berlin 1811, also in *Kl. Schr.* IV 1—34, Berlin 1874. Other literature in Geffcken *Griech. Lit.-Gesch.* II, Anmerkungen p. 7 n. 38.

² G. Rudberg, *De tempore Conuiuii Xenophontei adnotatiunculae*, Strena philol. Upsaliensis, Upsala 1922.

³ Cfr Lucian. *Fugitiv.* c. 18, Epictet. *sent.* 53.

⁴ Περὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀξιολύτου] περὶ Ξενοφώντος φασὶ λέγειν αὐτόν· οὗτος ἐν τῇ Ἀναβάσει ἱστόρησε τὰ Περσῶν, Κύρω συναελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀρτοξέρεην.

504 E βασιλέα. Plato is just mentioned once by Xenophon, *Mem.* III 6,1.

- 5) The story of the controversy regarding Cyrus arises from a misinterpretation of the words ἡφθαί παιδείας. The meaning will be quite clear, if we compare *Leg.* 967 τῶν τοιούτων ἀπτεσθαι, occupy oneself with, cleave to, be sincerely interested in something. The point of the discussion in *Leg.* 694 is this: »Cyrus was not at all interested in giving his children a good education. So the Persian realm lost all its splendour during the reign of the cruel and uneducated Cambyses.» There is not a word about the education of Cyrus, the main subject of Xenophon's writing.¹
- 6) Plato is far from praising (ἐγκώμια) Menon, on the contrary he gives us the picture of a vain and conceited young man; Xenophon presents us with a bold exaggeration of the same character, certainly not without a personal note of disgust at this type of man. In the *Life of Thucydides* by Marcellinus the motif of jealousy is freely used: Herodotus, Timaeus, Philistus are censured and Ξενοφῶν δὲ Μένωνι λουδορεῖται τῷ Πλάτωνος ἐταίρῳ διὰ τὸν πρὸς Πλάτωνα ζῆλον.

The whole story of this ζηλοτυπία is a typical literary invention² based on misinterpretations and half-truths, grouped around a kernel of truth and supported by a series of disconnected quotations, which are sometimes even touched up to be made more convincing.

ἐκβάλλει — εἰσάγει] The comparison is as usual badly distorted. The customs prevailing at the symposia were a very popular theme³, and the starting-point was regularly the writings of Xenophon and Plato, especially the *Laws*. Thus we find an extract in Gellius XV 2 = *Leg.* 648 B, 649 B, 671 B, plagiarized by Macrobius II 8,4, and a piece of the Greek version in Athen. 186 B.

F Περὶ ψυχῆς] Cfr 506 B Περὶ ἀνδρείας. The prevalent opinion is that the double titles of the Platonic dialogues were introduced by

¹ See H. Raeder, *Platons philos. Entwicklung*, 1905, p. 196, Wilamowitz, *Platon* II 181, and summing up Praechter p. 207.

² Notice the word τεκμαιρομένοις ἡμῖν 504 E. It is notorious that the Socratics often wrote on the same themes and topics (ὑποθέσεων 504 E).

³ See J. Martin, *Symposion*, Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form, Paderborn 1931 (Studien-Drerup XVII: 1).

the Alexandrianian *πινακογράφοι*, Schmid-Stählin I⁶ 1, p. 643 n. 10. **504 F**
 The oldest references to the *Περὶ ψυχῆς* are found in *Ep. Plat.* 13, 363 A, and Callimachus *ep.* 23.¹

παραιτυχόντων] Xenophon could not have returned from his sacking of Asiatices, *Anab.* VII 8,23, and in his description of the death of Socrates *Mem.* IV 8,4 he does not pretend that he was present himself. The *παραγενόμενος* in the *Conv.* I 1 is a sort of guarantee of authenticity, *σφραγίς*, which has often become a pure literary cliché.²

ὁ μὲν Ξενοφῶν — ὁ δὲ Πλάτων] Something is wrong in the text of Athenaeus. If we read *Ξενοφῶν — διηγησαμένου — ὁ καλὸς Πλάτων*, we must presume 1) a very bad anacoluthon, but in spite of the fact that Athenaeus is often extremely careless in excerpting his sources, I dare not assume such a gross error, 2) a textual defect. Kaibel explains the fault by his well-known theory that our Athenaeus is a badly epitomized edition of the original work of Athenaeus in 30 books. **505 A B**

Elsewhere³ I have tried to show the shortcomings of this theory and a renewed study of the question has made me more and more convinced that Kaibel was wrong. Our Athenaeus is the original *υπόμνημα* of Athenaeus, and his work is essentially a series of loosely connected extracts from different authors. In copying his authors Athenaeus is very capricious; it is easy to prove that he has sometimes shortened his sources rather carelessly, but we must accept his text mainly in the form in which it is handed down to us. Kaibel and all those who take his theory for granted, always, as soon as they miss something in the text, have recourse to pretended lacunae; it cannot, of course, be disputed that there are lacunae but these are as a rule a consequence of the carelessness of Athenaeus himself or the copyists. Many of the so-called lacunae based on Kaibel's theory of the epitomized edition are, I am afraid, often nothing but unfruitful conjectures.

¹ See E. Nachmanson, *Der griech. Buchtitel*, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XLVII 1941: 19, p. 11.

² See G. Rudberg, *Sokrates bei Xenophon* (cited above p. 50) p. 11.

³ *De Athenaei Dipnosophistarum indole atque dispositione*, Apophoreta Lundström, Göteborg 1936. The first books are, as will be remembered, handed down to us only in the late epitome.

It may be observed here that the manuscript **E** is an epitome of a better and older MSS than **A**; it is therefore reasonable to consider its readings, but we must always suspect intentional corrections.

The whole sentence in 505 AB is written in what we call hypomnematic style: look at the expression *προδοσίαν, ὅτι*, the double asyndetic *ὥς*. Further there are some signs pointing to abbreviations having been made by the hand of Athenaeus, viz. the quotation from Stesichorus, introduced by the words *ὁ καλὸς Πλάτων*, and the word *μονονουχί*, which we find in various passages by Athenaeus' own hand, e. g. 224 B and 19 B. It is possible that the anacoluthon arose in the course of this abbreviation, when from the *ὁ μὲν — ὁ δὲ* construction Athenaeus slipped to the absolute genitive, but I have preferred a slight correction of the text. The *φαίνεται* of **E** seems too good to be true.

505 B *χαλεπός, ἀσελγής*] do not at all tally with the description of Xenophon. Typical calumnia.

ὁ . . . κακολογήσας] the same expression 505 C *ὁ . . . εἰπών*.

BC *πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ*] is a highly controversial point. In my opinion Athenaeus cannot have used the original work of Herodicus. I find it very probable that the extracts from Herodicus were made by Phavorinus (the time of Trajan and Hadrian) in his great compilation *Παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία*¹ and Phavorinus' book was to some extent used by Athenaeus. We can unmistakably trace Phavorinus in four passages here.

a) 218 A. Somebody must have added this defence of Socrates to the work of Herodicus. I have already before pointed out that it is incredible that Athenaeus did this himself. It is not in accordance either with his style or with his general interests. Upon the whole, Athenaeus has mostly been overrated. He is just an ordinary compiler and his sources are, generally speaking, not original works of older times but other compilations from the first century A. D. or later with one, likewise general exception: his interest in piquant

¹ There has been much discussion around Phavorinus. The chief contributions (Rudolph, Bapp, Nietzsche, Usener, Gabrielsson) and other literature together with a summary of the different problems by Wentzel *RE* VI 2078 (1907).

details, curiosities and *παράδοξα*, which is the signature of his mode **505 B C** of making his excerpts, has also led him to studies of his own in certain minor Hellenistic authors, such as Hegesander¹, but — and I wish to lay stress on this as very important for everybody who seeks information in Athenaeus — it is extremely seldom that he makes any addition of his own.

Thus 218 A is an addition made by someone interested in the history of philosophy and initiated in the literature in question. That is all we can say with certainty here.

b) 505 A. The verbal conformity in some parts of this passage and Gellius XIV 3 cannot be accidental. As Maass and after him Rudolph² have shown, Phavorinus is the source of Gellius, and this seems to be generally accepted. It seems probable, though still not quite certain, that Athenaeus too copied Phavorinus.

c) 506 C. *ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος* — *Νικαιεύς* clearly proves itself a later addition and Diogenes III 62 gives us definitely the name — Phavorinus. Moreover it has been handed down as a quotation from the very little known biographer Nicias. We find the same type of addition in Athen. 162 E = Diog. Laert. VII 36.

d) 504 BC = Diog. Laert. III 48 is the final and convincing proof. It is evidently an addition made by a learned polyhistor, interested in *εὐρήματα* and everything thus points to Phavorinus. As it is extremely improbable from what I have said above and from all we know about Athenaeus' methods and character, that he himself made these four important additions, the only possible conclusion is: Phavorinus made the excerpts from Herodicus (perhaps we may go one step further, as I am going to show below) and Athenaeus transcribed him, either his *Παντοδαπὴ ἱστορία*, which seems more likely, or his *Ἀπομνημονεύματα*.

Νικίας ὁ Νικαιεύς] There are no conclusive arguments as to the **505 C** age of this author, but R. Philipson, *RE* Suppl. VII 569 (1940), is certainly wrong. Sotion is the well-known biographer, whose *ἀκμὴ* lies between 200 and 170 B. C.³, not Seneca's teacher. Athenaeus,

¹ See Hackmann, *De Athenaeo Naucratis*, D. Berlin 1912, and other literature in my above-mentioned paper *De Athenaei indole*.

² Maass, *Phil. Unter.* III 77, Rudolph, *Philol. Suppl.*-bd VI (1891) p. 122.

³ Good summing-up by J. Stenzel *RE* II. Reihe, III: 1 p. 1235 (1927).

i. e. his source, probably Phavorinus, apparently knew the *διαδοχή* of Sotion only through Nicias.¹ And, as I have shown, this passage does not belong to Herodicus; it is, therefore, of no use to us if we can fix the time of the last-mentioned author at about 145 B. C. Nicias remains a riddle.²

505 C *μιμητικὴ ποίησις*] A *locus conclamatus* in the discussion of the notion of *μίμησις*. The literature is recorded by A. Gudemann, *Aristoteles' Poetik*, 1934, p. 80 and 87. I shall summarize some important points — although I am afraid I am not possessed of Ithuriel's spear.

a) The text is in good order. The fragment from Aristotle's *Περὶ ποιητῶν* has innumerable times been stretched on the bed of Procrustes. For my part and in accordance with Castelvetro³ and Bernays,⁴ I urge that nothing should be altered in the text handed down. *οὔκουν* is absurd, moreover it is mostly followed by *γε* in the Attic.⁵ *μὴ φῶμεν* is the same deliberative subjunctive as in Plato in similar cases, e. g. *Phileb.* 35 E. Outside the dialogues we never find this form of question in Aristotle. As soon as we realize that we have to deal with a detached quotation from a dialogue, where the notion of the word *μίμησις* was discussed at some length, the text is clear and fully intelligible. The mimes of Sophron and

¹ Wilamowitz, *Antigonos* p. 32 and Susemihl I 505. The same is true of Sosicrates, 163 F = Diog. Laert. VI 13 and 422 E = Diog. Laert. VI 90.

² Usener in his paper *Die Unterlage des Laertios Diogenes*, SbAkBerl. 1892, comes to the conclusion that Nicias work was finished »gegen Ende der Neronischen Zeit«. This would help to explain why Phavorinus had a predilection for this work. But one might as well vindicate the reverse, that is to say that we know Nicias only through Sotion, and as a matter of fact I find this more probable.

³ Castelvetro, *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata e sposta*, Basel 1576, p. 20, only adds a mark of interrogation after *μμήσεις*.

⁴ J. Bernays, *Grundzüge der verlor. Abh. des Aristoteles über Wirkung der Tragödie*, Abh. d. hist.-philos. Ges. in Breslau I 1857, p. 187. »Sollen wir demnach leugnen, dass die nicht einmal metrischen, aber schon durch ihren Namen als Nachahmungen auftretenden Werke des Sophron oder die Dialoge des Alexamenos von Teos, die ersten sokratischen welche geschrieben wurden, Prosa und dennoch Nachahmungen (consequently poetical works, i. e. in the sense of the word that has been the subject of discourse in this dialogue) seien.« Cfr Plat. *Rep.* 606 E *ἐν μμήσει κωμωδικῇ ἢ καὶ ἰδίᾳ* (prose, as 366 E *ἴδιοι λόγοι*).

⁵ Denniston, *The Greek Particles* 422.

the Socratic dialogues belong to an *εἶδος*,¹ for which a general name **505 C** was lacking. »Socratic« in this context denotes the *εἶδος* of the dialogues, i. e. their literary type, and does not allude to the subject-matter or imply that the author was one of the disciples of Socrates. In this sense one may justly say that Sophron's mimes and the Socratic dialogues are both *λόγοι* and *μιμήσεις*.² Plato's dialogues are *μεταξὺ ποιήματος καὶ πεζοῦ λόγον*, Diog. Laert. IV 38 from Aristoteles.

Jahn objects in his discussion of the passage³ that it should not be doubtful whether we have a right to accept Sophron's mimes as *μιμήσεις* or not. Jahn, who reads the passage *οἷον οὐδὲ ἐμμέτρους τοὺς καλουμένους Σωκράτους μίμους μὴ φῶμεν εἶναι λόγους ἢ μὴ⁴ μιμήσεις τοὺς Ἀλεξάμενου*, seems entirely to have overlooked its character as part of a dialogue, in which the Aristotelean notion of *μίμησις* was elaborately worked out.

b) Notice the confused series of arguments and the interruption in the text. Herodicus' aim is to calumniate Plato. Plato has rejected mimetic poetry, though he has himself written mimes, of which, however, he is not the inventor. Then comes the addition about Aristotle, probably picked up by Phavorinus in some Hellenistic catalogue of *εὐρήματα*.⁵ Phavorinus was especially interested in *εὐρεταί*.

It may be added that the discussion on *μίμησις* in Plato *Rep.* 393 D is totally different from the esthetical theory of *μίμησις* in Aristotle. According to Plato *διήγησις* and *μίμησις* are quite different things.

κὰν ἄλλοις] corresponds to 505 B *ἐν μὲν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ*.

218 E

Χαιρεφῶντος] There is in this connection a story about Apollonius Molo, which must be definitely put an end to. The *schol. Nub.* 144 runs as follows:

¹ *Poet.* 1447 b 10.

² To Gudeman's list of literature add J. M. S. McDonald, *Character-Portraiture in Epicharmus, Sophron and Plato*, Sewanee Tenn. 1931, where the material is collected.

³ *Hermes* II (1867) p. 237.

⁴ Bernhardy *Gr. Lit.-Gesch.* II 2, 471 has also inserted this, but gives quite another interpretation.

⁵ See A. Kleingünther, *Πρωτος εὐρετής*, *Philol. Suppl.* 26 (1933).

- 218 E σοφὸς Σοφοκλῆς, σοφώτερος δ' Εὐριπίδης,
ἀνδρῶν δὲ πάντων Σωκράτης σοφώτατος.

τοῦτον τὸν χρησμὸν ὁμολογῶν ἐν τῇ κατὰ φιλοσόφων ψεύδεσθαι φησι τὴν Πυθίαν· τοὺς γὰρ Πυθικοὺς χρησμοὺς ἐξαμέτρους εἶναι.

Menagius in his commentary on Diog. Laert. II 37 has reluctantly suggested the reading ὁ Δημοχάρης instead of the unintelligible ὁμολογῶν. Dübner, in his edition of the scholia, has boldly altered the text as follows: τοῦτον Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων ἐν τῷ κατὰ φιλοσόφων ἐψεῦσθαι φησι· τοὺς γὰρ Πυθικοὺς κτλ. Though recorded in Bekker's edition of the scholia, Menagius' conjecture — which is at least a very ingenious suggestion — has been almost forgotten, whilst Dübner's arbitrary substitution has become the basis of a theory about Molo, which we find in all handbooks.¹ Molo was according to Diog. Laert. II 34 an *obtrektor Platonis* and wrote a book *Κατὰ φιλοσόφων*.

Well, let us now see how Diogenes has it: ἀλλὰ τοι Μόλων ἀπεχθῶς ἔχων πρὸς αὐτόν, Οὐ τοῦτο, φησί, θαυμαστὸν εἰ Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἀλλ' εἰ Πλάτων ἐν Σικελίᾳ. Anyone who is familiar with this kind of literature sees at once that the primary fact in this passage is the witty quotation, known to us also from Cicero *ad Att.* IX 9,1 *de optimatibus, sit sane ita ut vis, sed nosti illud Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ*. Presumably Cicero had this directly from his acquaintance with Molo. The words ἀπεχθῶς ἔχων is a commentary, added by the person who wrote down or collected this apophthegma. This way of »interpreting» witty bon-mots is quite typical of ancient biographical literature. Animosity and hostility are felt everywhere.

Molo's book is a pure invention like so much else in this literature. Cicero would have known of it.

The reading of the mss is ἐν τῇ κατὰ φιλοσόφων and we have to understand *κατηγορία*, *κατατριβή* or (more probable) *καταδρομή* (τῶν) *φιλοσόφων*. The possibility that it is a quotation from the famous speech of Demochares in 306 cannot be denied.

- 218 F πυνθανόμενον] instead of πυνθανομένῳ; other examples of the same kind in Kühner-Gerth § 495 c, p. III f.

¹ See e. g. *RE* II 143.

4. *The calumny of the philosophers.*

[*Ἐανθίππη*] Besides the oral tradition, of which we know nothing, **219 A B** the following contemporary references are known to us: 1) Plato *Phaed.* 60 A *γινώσκεις γάρ*,¹ 2) Xenophon *Conv.* II 10 *γυνή τῶν οὐσῶν, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τῶν γεγενημένων καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων χαλεπωτάτη*, follows the simile of the horse; perhaps some traces may be recognized in *Mem.* II 2.

This is all. There is nothing in Aristophanes or the other authors of comedy. We can follow the gradual development of the tradition: 1) *χαλεπή*, Plato, Xenophon, Herodicus, Diog. Laert. II 37, Galen. *de an. perturb.* c. 8, (*Scripta minora* Marquardt I p. 31), Gell. I 17. 2) *περιχέασα*, DL II 37, Herodicus, Seneca *de const. sap.* 18. 3) *ἰμάτιον*, DL II 37, Marc. Ant. XI 28, Ael. *VH VII* 10. 4) *insuesco*, Gell. I 17, Plut. *de inimic.* 90 E, *de cohib. ira* 461 E. And of course the Christian Fathers have embroidered this profitable theme, e. g. John Chrysostom, *Hom. XVI in Ep. I ad Corinthios*.

[*Ἀσπασία μέντοι*] by this particle an exceptionally good example **C** is introduced.

The theme of Aspasia in Socratic literature is exhaustively treated by H. Dittmar, *Aeschines*, Phil. Unters. 21 (1912).

Plato's ironical representation of Aspasia in the *Menexenus* is the starting-point of all the stories about Aspasia as a *διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν*. All slander about her as the great courtesan of her time originates in the old comedy, but there are besides *Acharn.* 515 f. only a few fragments left of Eupolis' *Δῆμοι* 98 K., *Φίλοι* 274 K. and Cratinus' *Χείρονες* 241 K. These are the two main sources.

As an *ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλος* in a good sense Aspasia is presented in the fragment of Aeschines' dialogue *Aspasia*, which Cicero has handed down to us *De invent.* I 51, and in Xenophon's *Oec.* III 14 *Ἀσπασία σοι ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδείξει*. It is a typical motif in the dialogues of the Socratics — and so there must be some kernel of truth in it — that Socrates always went to specialists in order to learn something: he is seen trying to acquire professional knowledge from bootmakers, architects, politicians, but also from Diotima, Aspasia

¹) In the same sense about Apollodorus *ὁ μανικός*: *οἶσθα γάρ πον τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν τρόπον αὐτοῦ*.

219 C and Theodote, the paramour of Alcibiades. This is a constant trait in all the later Socratic literature, and when in the time of the second sophistic school these Socratic themes once more become popular, the anecdotes are resuscitated but often interpreted *in malam partem*; still later, they are quite distorted, e. g. Synes. *Dion.* 59 A Σωκράτης Ἀσπασία προσεφοίτα κατὰ χάριν τοῦ τὰ ἐρωτικά παιδευθῆναι, or Max. Tyr. XVIII 46 ἀλλὰ καὶ διδάσκαλος ἐπιγέγραπται τῆς τέχνης (sc. τῆς ἐρωτικῆς) Ἀσπασίαν τὴν Μιλησίαν καὶ Διοτίμαν τὴν Μαντινικὴν. In the rhetor-schools the theme was used, as Marcellinus quotes, as παράδειγμα ἀπιθάνου¹. Περικλῆς τῇ Ἀσπασίᾳ συνόντα Σωκράτη κρίνει μοιχείας.

In the Hellenistic novelistic poetry the motif was gratefully adopted, the most famous example being Hermesianax *fr.* 2, 89—94:

οἶω δ' ἐχλίνεν δν ἔσοχον ἔχρη Ἀπόλλων
 ἀνθρώπων εἶναι Σωκράτη ἐν σοφίῃ,
 Κύπρις μηνίουσα πυρὸς μένει ἐκ δὲ βαθείης
 ψυχῆς κουφοτέρως ἔξεπότησ' ἀνίας
 οἶκί' ἐς Ἀσπασίης πωλεύμενος οὐδέ τι τέκμαρ
 εὔρε λόγῳ πολλὰς εὐράμενος διόδους.

Hermesianax is one of the oldest representatives of the Peripatetic interpretative technique, inaugurated by Aristotle. But even Chamaeleon used this new method to wring the most abstruse biographical details out of the old literature.²

In Herodicus' poem about Aspasia some words in the *Symposion* 217 A and 219 D together with *Menexenus* 235 A ff. may be regarded as the origin and starting-point. But the relations between Socrates and Alcibiades are, as Dittmar rightly observes, just reversed: Socrates is here the languishing mawkish lover, who nearly cries his eyes out from emotional weakness; Hellenistic sentimental eroticism of the usual kind throughout. Already in the *Alcibiades I* the relations between the two men are set forth in that light.

We do not know the author of the poem, probably it is Herodicus himself. With regard to the contents, form and language it agrees wholly

¹ Schol. in *Hermog.* Στάσεις, Rhet. Gr. Walz IV 189, 33.

² In an edition of the fragments of Chamaeleon in preparation I propose to enter more fully into the matter.

with the usual Hellenistic epigram and elegy. A comparison with 219 C e. g. Leonidas of Tarent shows, however, that it is an amateur who has tried his skill with his pen. In a quite incredible manner the language is crammed with Homeric phrases: οὐκ ἔλαθες δηχθείς *Od.* 19,91, θηχθείς φρένα *Il.* 5,493, μῆδ' ἀπιθήσης *Il.* 1,220, ὅπως ἤκουσα (temp.) *Il.* 12,208, *Od.* 3,393, τίπτε δεδάκονσαι *Il.* 16,17, τίπτε — ἦ *Il.* 1,203 and so on. The metaphors are dull, overloaded and artificial, and in these few lines there occur certain repetitions.

σῶμα λιπαίνω ἰδρῶτι] An accusative of the same kind in Soph. *Aias* 10 κάρα στάζων ἰδρῶτι. The immortal motif from Sappho in beggar's garb!

γός] in the meaning of »tear«, is elegiac usage in imitation of D Homer, but βλεφάρων γός is artificial; similarly βλεφάρων ἰστυπεῖς βάσιες *Anth. Pal.* V 27.

κάτοχος] is active and is followed up by αἰρήσεις which, as a matter of fact, is a clumsy pleonasm after κατόχοιο and καθέξεις. The Muses are the most patient servants of Greek poetry; by means of an infinite variety of epithets the poet takes them in his service for every purpose imaginable. Plato talks contemptuously of this Μοῦσα ἡδυσμένη, *Rep.* 607 A. We meet the word in an active sense in a passage in Suidas (from Procopii *anecd.* c. 1) κάτοχος ἦδη τῷ πόθῳ τούτου γεγενημένη καὶ διαφανῆς ἐρωτόληπτος οὔσα, and in Plut. 431 B, who tells us that Cato Minor was κάτοχος καὶ μνημονικός. The oldest reference is perhaps in Hermippus' *Δημόται* I 230 Kock. Otherwise the passive sense is dominating: κάτοχος ἐκ Μουσῶν, inspired by the Muses, Pollux IV 52. Ὀπτήρια is explained by Pollux II 59 εἴρεται δὲ καὶ ὀπτήρια τὰ δῶρα τὰ παρὰ τοῦ πρώτον ἰδόντος νυμφίου τὴν νύμφην δεδομένα, cfr Eurip. *Ion* 1127.

Thus Aspasia counsels Socrates — a very artificial device indeed — to snare Alcibiades with the bewitching power of music, and in the form of music »send a bridegroom's gift of his soul into the ears of the beloved«.

λινωστατούμενος] This metaphor is common in the Hellenistic epigrams, cfr Meleager, *Anth. Pal.* V 177.

- 219 E στέρνοις ἐνναίων σκηπτὸς πόθου (πόθος codd.) ὄμμασι θραυσθεῖς] »the lightning of passion dwelling in your breast and being crashed by your eyes.« This sounds like sheer wish-wash, unworthy of even a third-class poet. Two or three metaphors have been contaminated: 1) στέρνοις ἐνναίων κρύφιος πόθος ὄμμασι λάμπων, 2) ἔρωσ ἔσκηπεν εἰς αὐτόν, cfr Alciph. I ep. 13, 3) ἐθραύσθη ἡ ἐλπίς, ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, cfr *Aves* 466. But still it is difficult to believe that a copyist put together this muddle. I am afraid the author of this poem and his turbid imagination must be blamed for the »lightning dwelling in your breast«.

Casaubonus tried to explain the words in the following way: πόθος ἐνναίων στέρνοις, θραυσθεῖς ὄμμασιν (= ἐξ ὀμμάτων, but where do we find a parallel to this strange usage) παιδὸς ἀνικήτητος, σκηπτὸς (= ὥσπερ σκηπτὸς). I cannot find this explanation sound. Το σκηπτὸς πόθου, on the other hand, there is a parallel in Aesch. *Pers.* 715 σκηπτὸς λοιμοῦ. The lightning is a favourite motif in Hellenistic love poetry; beside natural metaphors such as γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ἀστεροπαῖ we find very strained expressions, as when the fair one's *πυγὴ* is called ἀστεροπὴ μελέων, *Anth. Pal.* V 35.

τίθασόν σοι ποιῆσαι] is a common expression, e. g. *Anth. Pal.* V 178.

τριάκοντα ἐτῶν] The date of Alcibiades' birth is unknown.¹ His father Clinias was killed at Coronea 446. Herodicus makes it out to be the year 450 and attributes the congress of the philosophers in the *Protagoras* to 420/19, 218 CD. See Toepffer in *RE* I 1516 and above p. 49.

- τῶν κωμικῶν κακῆγοροι μᾶλλον] This is of course not true, but —
220 A and this is still worse — Herodicus knew it ὥς τις καὶ ἄλλος. We have only a few undisputed fragments of his great work *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*, but we are able to compare what Plato, according to Herodicus, had to say about Chaerephon with the list of invectives of the comedy, handed down to us by *schol. in Apolog.* 20 A: Χαιρεφῶν οὗτος ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἰσχνὸς ἦν καὶ ὠχρὸς, (cfr 188 C from *Nub.* 103) τὸ δὲ ἦθος συκοφάντης καὶ κόλαξ, πρὸς δὲ καὶ κλέπτῃς καὶ αὐχμηρὸς, τὴν δὲ περιουσίαν πένης. Εὐπολὺς μὲν οὖν ἐν Πόλεσι διὰ τὴν χροίαν πύξινον αὐτόν

¹ »Natus videtur a. 417 vel 416«, *Kirchner Prosop.* 598.

καλεῖ, Ἀριστοφάνης δ' ἐν Ὅρνισι νυκτερίδα, ἐν δὲ Τελμισσεῦσιν εἰς συ- **220 A**
κοφάντην ἀποσκώπτει, Κρατῖνος Πυτίνῃ εἰς ἀρχμηρὸν καὶ πένητα, Εὐπολῖς
δ' ἐν Κόλαξιν Καλλίου κόλακα λέγει, Ἀριστοφάνης δ' ἐν Δράμασι κλέπτειν,
ἐν δ' Ὡραῖς νυκτὸς αὐτὸν παῖδα καλεῖ. Perhaps this record is an ex-
tract from just the above-mentioned work of Herodicus! But even
the Epicurean Colotes knew how to use this arsenal in his fight
against the Academy.

εἴ γε] The particle signifies that the author restricts the reach
of his assertion to the examples referred to. This usage of εἴ γε is
very common in Hellenistic literature and Denniston, *The Greek*
Particles p. 141, gives some examples from older literature.

Τηλανγεῖ] This dialogue is commented on by Dittmar ch. VI, p.
213. Herodicus characterizes the persons introduced, the filthy
Pythagorist Telauges, who against all good custom paid the fuller a
half-obol a day to be able to borrow a homely ἱμάτιον on festive
occasions, whilst for every-day use he wore a κωδῖον¹, a man who
fastened his plain sandals with half-rotten leather straps; further
Critobulus, coquettish², amoral³, and sordid⁴.

καὶ † τελεσαντα τὸν ῥήτορα] The passage has been emended many **B**
times and Pohlenz discusses it at length in Dittmar's *Aeschines*, p.
230—1. Of course we must keep together τὸν δὲ Τηλανγῆν — οὐ
μετρίως διαγελᾶ and some kind of attribute must have been inserted.
Without totally neglecting the text-tradition we cannot overlook
ῥήτορα. Thus καίπερ εὐτελέστατον or τελειότατον seems to fit in well.

Ἀσπασία] See Judeich *RE* II 1719 and Dittmar *passim*.

κοάλεμος] is Hipponicus III (Natorp *Philol.* 51 (1892) p. 490),
son of Callias II λακκόπλουτος, who was himself the wealthiest man
of his time, and father of the well-known »rich« Callias. This Hippo-

¹ The Athenians generally used the sheepskin as a mattress.

² Bruns, *Liter. Porträt* p. 391.

³ ἀμαθία *Protag.* 357 DE.

⁴ ὑπαρότης τοῦ βίου, cfr Dittmar p. 235.

220 B nicus was killed at Delium 424, cfr. Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II 29. Plutarch *Cim.* 4 tells us that the grandfather of Cimon was called *κοάλεμος* δι' εὐήθειαν = *ματαιόφρων, μωρός, ἡλίθιος, ἀνόητος* according to the lexica. Cfr Numen. ap. Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* XII 651 A.

Καλλίας] The dialogue is treated by Dittmar ch. V, p. 186. Callias III inherited an enormous fortune from his father Hipponicus III in 423/2 (218 D) and his prodigality and extravagance were a favourite tittle-tattle in the old comedy¹.

There is a double sense in *διαφορά*, dissimilarity in manners and disagreement leading to quarrel. The dialogue obviously treated the subject from both points of view.

Dittmar has pointed out that Anaxagoras, in the writings of Aeschines, played a role similar to that of Socrates in the plays of Aristophanes. The meanness of the disciples was used as an argument in displaying the wickedness of the master.

²*Ἀξιόχῳ*] Dittmar p. 159.

C *ἐν θατέρῳ Κῦρος*] Herodicus apparently knew of two writings with the title of *Κῦρος*. Diogenes records no less than four, namely in vol. IV *Κῦρος*, in vol. V *Κῦρος ἢ περὶ βασιλείας*, in vol. X *Κῦρος ἢ ἐρώμενος* and *Κῦρος ἢ κατάσκοποι*. In the last case, however, the text is uncertain, see Dittmar p. 70. The account of the contents of the dialogue must be distorted in the same way as in the other reports of Platonic dialogues. A comparison between Ath. 534 C² and the other fragments in Winckelmanns edition shows us that Antisthenes has certainly criticized Alcibiades, but the charge of incest is surely to be regarded as one of this author's typical calumnious contaminations

¹ Ed. Meyer *Forsch.* II 28: »Das Haus des Kallias ist bekanntlich wie kein anderes attisches Geschlecht mit Hohn und Bosheiten überhäuft worden.«

² We learn from Satyrus that Alcibiades was *ἰσχυρός, ἀνδρώδης, ἀπαίδετος, πολυμηρός, ὠραῖος, ἐφ' ἡλικίας ἀπάσης*, how in Ionia he surpassed the Ionians in extravagances, in Thebes the Boeotians in physical exercises; in Thessalia he was a judge of horse-flesh, in Sparta he was more Spartan than the Spartans themselves, in Thracia he drank the Thracians under the table etc. All this can be proved to be exaggerations of statements found in the writings of the contemporaries. See Wilamowitz *Kydatheon* p. 74.

of a) Antisthenes' description of the conditions in Persia, b) his criticism of Alcibiades¹.

In his third chapter »*Die Alkibiadesdichtung der Sokratiker*» Dittmar treats the rich tradition with his usual thoroughness and sagacity, using and quoting the whole literature. By the aid of numerous fragments and notices he paints a vivid and coherent picture of the Cyrus-dialogues of Antisthenes. The manner he avails himself of the meagre information found in Herodicus is, however, so typical of his fanciful combinations, that I think it worthy of a closer scrutiny.

In the first place it should be pointed out, that the glimpse we are given in the present passage of *θάρετος τῶν Κύρων* must not be regarded as a bona fide account of its contents. We are justified in suspecting, that it is a deliberate misrepresentation of the same kind as the other distortions of Plato's dialogues. In my opinion every attempt at getting hold of the exact contents of Antisthenes' *Cyrus* by a forced interpretation of Herodicus' wording is doomed to fail from the outset. Under no circumstances can we rest assured that the interpretation is honest and correct. But that is what Dittmar does. He regards the words of Herodicus as a reliable source of information.

Dittmar's combinations are very interesting and there is a good deal of sound learning in his great reconstruction of the literary work of Aeschines. But sometimes I am afraid he is building castles of cards. His book is a projection of the famous work of Wilamowitz on Antigonus of Carystus, and even if Erwin Rohde's hard judgement² on this admirable book must be much modified, I am sorry to say I must state it seems me to be applicable to Dittmar's *Aeschines* to the full.

The peripatetic writers of biography patiently collected scraps of information and notices from the comedy, the Socratics, the rhetors

¹ I share the now prevalent opinion that Dümmler in his dissertation *Antisthenica*, reprinted in *Kl. Schriften I* (Leipzig 1901), and in his book *Akademika* (Giessen 1889), has drawn far too many conclusions from the scanty remains of the literary work of Antisthenes. Also Joel's attempt in *Der echte u. d. Xenophontische Sokrates* to reconstrue the dialogue of Antisthenes from *Alc. II* has not found approval; from my point of view this reconstruction suffers from exactly the same deficiencies as Dittmar's reconstruction of *Cyrus*.

² *Kleine Schriften* p. 356.

220 C and from the various polemical pamphlets of the philosophic schools. Thus for instance we have a modest remnant of such a collection about the family of Callias in the extensive scholion to Lucian's *Iuφφ. Conf.* 16, p. 57 Rabe, where among other things we read *αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπεμίγη Ἀλκιβιάδης παρὰ τοὺς νόμους*¹, and from Satyrus we have a rather extensive fragment (Ath. 534) in a more novelistic form. It is useful to compare them; such are the sources our author has used above all.

I return to the passage in Herodicus. »Die Notiz lehrt mancherlei«, says Dittmar p. 77. In my opinion it teaches us neither more nor less about the *Kῦρος* of Antisthenes than for instance the statement that Plato had said *ὅτι Ξανθίππη χαλεπὴ ἦν γυνή, ἥτις καὶ νιπτῆρας αὐτοῦ κατέχει τῆς κεφαλῆς*, that is to say there is a kernel of truth with a liberal admixture of fanciful calumny. Only in combination with parallel tradition, whose primary sources are known to us, such information is of any use.

D *Πολιτικός*] This is the only fragment left of this dialogue, which is not recorded in the extensive list of writings; Diog. Laert. VI 15, at least not under this title. It is likely that, like Plato in the *Gorgias*, Antisthenes too wished to settle an account with the Athenian democracy. At least on this one point the two ever-quarrelling Socratics have been unanimous. According to Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles u. Athen* p. 183, Aeschines too wrote dialogues of this kind; I can, however, find no tradition about such a work.

καταδρομὴν περιέχει] The same expression 506 D.

Ἀρχέλαος] In vol. X in the list of Diogenes VI 15; this is the only fragment left, but possibly Ath. 216 B may be added². Dümmler maintains that the *καταδρομὴ Γοργίου* in Dio Chrys. or. XIII ultimately goes back to the dialogue of Antisthenes.

Ἀσπασία] In vol. V in the list of Diogenes. Wilamowitz identified this Archestratus with one who at Notion succeeded Alcibiades in

¹ Olympiod. *Comm. in Alc. I.* (ed. Creuzer) p. 173 the story is still worse treated, see Dittmar p. 77 n. 10.

² Hirzel, *Der Dialog* I 125.

the command¹, and he has likewise, but on very uncertain grounds, **220 D** identified Euphrenor with the *πρεσβευτῆς πρὸς τοὺς Καμαριναίους* of the year 415². The latter however seems to be identical with the archon Euphemus 417/16 mentioned by Herodicus 217 AB.

οἴκημα] Aesch. I 96 and elsewhere in the meaning of brothel. *μικρὰ οἰκήματα* cannot mean anything but »small houses», as Plut. *Per.* 171 B uses it in this sense.

Σάθωνα] In vol. VI in the list of Diogenes. *Σάθων ἡ περὶ τοῦ ἀντιλέγειν* is the first great polemic work directed against Plato, Dümmler *Akad.* p. 202. The meaning of the word is explained *Schol. in Theocr.* IV 62 C (Wendel) p. 153 and more profusely by R. Fenk, *Adversarii Platonis*, Jena 1913, p. 80.

τούτοις γὰρ] This seems to be a passage from the speech of Demochares, dealt with below. **E**

οὐ δημηγόρος] Of course it would also be possible to interpret *δημος* as »democracy». At all events the whole sentence must be understood as a phrase from the passionate speech of Demochares in 306.

ἐργαστηρίων] [Demosth.] c. *Naer.* 67, or. 59, 1367 (of *πόρνοι*) *όπόσαι ἂν ἐπ' ἐργαστηρίον καθῶνται*, compare *οἴκημα* above. Luc. *de salt.* 25 says: *ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὰ διδασκαλεῖα τῶν ἀθλητρίδων ἐφοῖτα καὶ παρ' ἐταίρας γυναικὸς οὐκ ἀπηξίου σπονδαῖόν τι ἀκούειν τῆς Ἀσπασίας*, not to speak of the filthy calumny of the Christian Fathers. Cfr Ath. 569 F.

πόθων θέλγητρα] This affected expression, no doubt borrowed **F** from some poet, discloses the workmanship of Athenaeus from *τοιαῦτα γὰρ* — *κατασιωπήσομαι*.

Athenaeus seldom quotes long continuous passages. If he finds something worth quoting but too extensive, he divides it into several parts by inserting other things. I suppose he does this also in order

¹ Xen. *Hell.* I 5, 16 and Kirchner *RE* II 459, n. 10.

² Thuc. VI 75, Wilamowitz *Aristot. u. Athen* I 69, n. 40, cfr Dittmar p. 13 n. 42.

220 F to conceal his immediate sources, which he hardly ever refers to. We can often catch him rounding off his stories. That is to say, a rounding off in a literary sense does not occur; as a rule he enumerates some interesting glosses or names, cementing the whole with a lot of high-sounding words, veiled, poetical, i. e. artificial, phrases or obvious quotations of proverbs or household words. In this case we meet the favourite phrase *ἐπιλίποι ἄν* and a quotation adapted to the purpose.

It is interesting to observe that Athenaeus, the Oxyrynchos Papyrus and Parisinus 1811 read *πλήθει — ἀτοπία*, whilst Galenus and codd. **BT** read *πλήθει — ἀτοπία*.

Nico, *ἡ Αἴξ καλουμένη* — we can guess the reason why — is often mentioned by Athenaeus, 582—584, *ἡ ὀπιόητος Νικώ* Asclepiades *Anth. Pal.* V 150.

Callistrate is mentioned only here and such is the case with Pythonicus.

The more famous is Philaenis *ἡ ἀναισχυντογράφος*, Ath. 335 CD, 457 D, Timaeus ap. Polyb. XII 13, whom Suidas quotes s. v. *βορνεοσταγῇ ἔρην* and *Δημοχάρης*, further Lucian *Amor.* 28 with *schol.* *ταύτην τὴν Φιλανίδα ἦν Φιλοκράτης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος κωμωδοποιὸς* (unknown)¹ *ἐξεπόμευσεν ὡς ἑταιριστρίαν καὶ τριβάδα*, *Pseudol.* 24, *Dialog. Mer.* 6,1. Suidas s. v. *Ἀστυάνασσα* gives us an idea of this writer of obscenities, who was unusually lewd even for those outspoken times.

505 C *Διαβάλλει*] Basilus has probably used the same source as Herodicus, viz. the speech of Demochares rearranged in some biographic compilation.

Πολυτεία] 562 CD is quoted more exhaustively in Ath. 433 F together with a lexical notice on the word *δύρα* and 443 F as a commentary on *οὐ χροὶ νῦν μεθέειν*. As usual it has been torn out of its context and interpreted *in malam partem*.

D *Γοργίας*] There are many good stories about Gorgias, distinguished by the remarkable fact that they all place him in a favourable light

¹ Aeschryon *fr.* 60 (Ath. 335 B) is a eulogy of *Φιλανίς ἡ ὀπιόητος*, by which he wishes to clear her from the calumny of a certain Polycrates.

as a sensible and witty man without bad intentions¹. Thus there is **505 D** for once no vilifying calumny, perhaps in order that he might serve as a foil to the *obtrectatio Platonis*. The story given here is another version of the story about Socrates, Diog. Laert. III 35, surely a late invention.

ιαμβίζεν] Hesych. *λοιδορεῖν, κακολογεῖν* in Archilochian sense.

παρὰ Πλάτωνος] Rossi has cut out these words, because Socrates **E** is the interlocutor in the Gorgias. But still he cannot be justified to do that or to insert *παρὰ Σωκράτους*, for even the contemporaries clearly understood that Plato expressed his own opinions in Socrates' name. Whether Gorgias really uttered these words or they were put in his mouth by later biographers, it is natural that he should say: »Such discussions I have never had with Plato».

Φαίδωνα] A typical duplicate.

Τίμων] The *Silloi* were written about 280 and commented on by Sotion about 200 B. C. Etymological jests are very common in his witty verses, cfr *fr.* 30 Diels *πλατίστατος*, *fr.* 34 D. *πλατώνει* in the double sense of *πλατωνίζεν* *fr.* 35 D. *πλατορημοσύνη*.

θαύματα] intentionally ambiguous. With the epic sense is associated the meaning »puppet-show» Plat. *Rep.* 514 B and »mountebank gambols» Xen. *Conv.* II 1, VII 3. Herodicus of course also suggests chronological *θαύματα*.

Παρμενίδη] In the dialogue Parmenides the whole discussion must **F** obviously have presented to every listener the appearance of pure fiction. As everybody must have understood that these thoughts could not in reality have been uttered by Socrates, the setting too could be arbitrarily arranged. This dialogue and the *Menexenus* are the only ones where the anachronisms are introduced quite deliberately.

¹ Blass, *Att. Beredsamkeit* I 49, Diels, *Vors.* 76.

505 F *Τίμαιον*] corrected by Ionsius, *De script. hist. philos.* p. 36. The epitome too presents *Φαῖδρον*, but as Macrobius has fortunately translated this passage, we can see that he used a manuscript which was better than ours, for it is hardly credible that he corrected the tradition. *Φαῖδρος* is impossible; even if he were *ἐρώμενος Σωκράτους* (Plato says nothing), this is no anachronism. Owing to bad disposition some of the facts are partly repeated from 217 D.

506 A *Δυσμενὴς ἦν*] The passage from Dionysius contains some points of concordance, which seem to imply that he was acquainted with the Pergamene anti-platonic tradition. First those are enumerated whom Plato derided (cfr 505 C — 506 A), then Plato is accused of *φιλοτιμία*. It is not at all impossible that Dionysius read the treatise of Herodicus or the *Homeric Problems* of Heraclitus.

Ἐν τῷ Ἰωνί] Plato's description of the poets 534 A ff. as *οὐκ ἔμφορονες ὄντες* has been distorted in the most ridiculous manner. In 541 CD Plato gives examples of how the Athenians chose even non-Athenians for military commanders, repeated by Aelian XI 5 *τίσιν ἐχρῶντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς*. When our author quoted this passage in this manner, this can be explained only by the circumstance that he could assume that none of his readers would know the original work of Plato — and this happened in Pergamon about 140 B. C.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ Μένωνι] As is well known Socrates refers to Themistocles, Aristides, Pericles and Thucydides in order to show how distinguished fathers did not succeed in making their sons equally distinguished. Our author has consciously made the same mistake as Anytus 94 E *ὦ Σώκρατες, ῥαδίως μοι δοκεῖς κακῶς λέγειν ἀνθρώπους*. Plato's and Xenophon's *Menon* are compared 505 B; also see the commentary on 507 A *Ἀντισθένην*.

B *ὀψιμαθεῖς*] Not Plato — he probably refers to Antisthenes — but Isocrates uses this word in his censure of the Eristics, among whom he also counted Plato. *Προπηλακίζειν* is a favourite expression of Plato's. *Τὴν ἐκ Χίου φυγὴν* is a bold distortion of Plato's words.

Περὶ ἀνδρείας] For the title see the commentary to 504 F. The 506 B hypomnematic style is obvious, the predicate *κακολογεῖ* is lacking.

εἰς φῶς λέγεσθαι] a contamination of *εἰς φῶς ἔλθεῖν, ἄγειν, πέμπειν*.

ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος — *Νικαιεύς*] This is a later addition by Phavo- c
rinus, see the commentary to 505 C. The *First Alcibiades* was, in spite of the opinion of Friedländer and others¹, not written by Plato. Regarding the date of the *Second Alcibiades* it seems to me that Bickel², whose thesis is generally accepted, did not attach enough importance to tradition in this passage. If we know Nicias only through Sotion, which is not improbable³, and he ascribed this dialogue to Xenophon, it can hardly belong to the school of Arcesilas. For if it was written in the school of Arcesilas, this would be in the second half of the third century, and if Nicias is prior to Sotion, he too lived at that time and would hardly have assigned a contemporary work to Xenophon. Now, it must be confessed, the time of Nicias is disputed. The philosophical subject-matter of the dialogue points towards 300. If the dialogue was written at that time, Nicias, living about 225, could easily have accepted it as an old work and assigned it to Xenophon.

τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα σιωπῶ, πολλ' ἂν ἔχων εἰπεῖν] is the usual form of this aposiopesis. But even in Demosthenes we find bold anacoloutha in connection with this rhetorical figure, e. g. *Olynth.* 3,27.

εἰκαῖον κριτήν] The words are not found in Plato or in *Alc. I.* *Εἰκαῖος* of a person is not at all found before Polybius. It would be possible to interpret them as a reflection of *Alcyon* 3 *εἰόκαμεν κτλ.* but as I have made probable, the notice about the *Alcyon* is a later

¹ Recently C. Vink, *Platos Eerste Alkibiades*, Amsterdam 1939, has contributed to the discussion. He admits how difficult it is to understand the treatment of the *δαιμόνιον*. Above all: the absence of irony, this feature so predominant in Plato's style, makes it impossible to believe the dialogue to be a work of the master himself.

² *Archiv f. Gesch. d. Philos.* 17 (1904) p. 460.

³ Compare above p. 505 C. A. Brinkmann, *Quaest. de dialogis Platoni falso addictis*, D. Bonn 1891, curiously enough assigns Nicias to the time of Sulla and the dialogue *Alcyon* to »saec. III vel saec. II ineunte«.

addition. The fact is here as so often before, that the author unscrupulously introduces into Plato's text a sense that suits his purposes. Truth, untruth and half-truth are mixed together.

After *κριτήν* our manuscripts add *εὐπρόκωπον* according to the old editions, *ἔτι δὲ πρόκωπον* according to Kaibel. This must be a gloss, added under the influence of the following *εὐπρόσωπον*. The right word, according to *Alc. I* 119 B, would have been *καὶ ἀπαίδευστον*.

506 D τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ] The conjecture of Valckenaer is of course all right, but probably our careless author really wrote αὐτοῦ.

ὀργυροκόπον] as in 220 F. Olympiodorus and Herodicus present the same reading, whilst the codd. **BT** have *ὀργυροτρόφον*. Plato in his comedy *Περιαλγής* (Kock I 630) gives Meidias this nickname, and the commentaries of the old scholiasts are found *Aves* 1297 and *Schol. Lucian. Iuḗp. trag.* 48, where the textual tradition, as is usual in the scholia, is very bad.

ἀποδύσαντας] In his customary fashion Herodicus sharpens Plato's *ἀποδύντα χρὴ αὐτόν θεάσασθαι* and moreover he adds out of his own resources a luscious phrase *ὀφθήσεται* — *ἀληθινού* which is easily revealed as non-platonic. To make the quotation more trustworthy, however, Herodicus (certainly not Athenaeus) adds the little word *φησί* to the phrase he himself has coined, in order to swindle his readers. Similar additions are treated 219 B (*νιπτῆρας*) and 220 F (the catalogue of hetaeras).

ἐν δὲ τῷ Κίμωνι] The passage is a mystification. There is no dialogue at all mentioned with this title, nor is Myronides mentioned by Plato, although his victory at Oenophyta is recorded in the *Menexenus* p. 242. Nevertheless two reasons make me assume that Herodicus really wrote the words handed down: no copyist can reasonably have introduced these names, and the words *αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κίμωνος* refer directly to *ἐν τῷ Κίμωνι*. If we take into consideration the great number of absurdities Herodicus has laid before his readers, it does not seem at all impossible that he should have gone so far as to forge the name of this dialogue. The lapsus in 505 F *Φαῖδρον* instead of *Τίμαιον* is not comparable and moreover we have an indirect tradition there.

For his calumnia Herodicus has used *Gorgias* 503 C τί δέ; Θεμιστοκλέα σὺν ἀκούεις ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γεγονότα καὶ Κίμωνα καὶ Μιλτιάδην καὶ Περικλέα τουτονὶ τὸν νεωστὶ τετελευτηκότα, and the epitomist has corrected Θεμιστοκλέους to Περικλέους, knowing his Plato. But we ought not to correct Herodicus here. Casaubon and after him others read ἐν δὲ τῷ Γοργία οὐδὲ τῆς Θεμιστοκλέους φεῖδεται κατηγορίας οὐδὲ τῆς Περικλέους καὶ Μιλτιάδου. It is hard to imagine how so many mistakes could have arisen. Only Plut. *de gloria Athen.* 345 E Myronides and Alcibiades are mentioned together.

If we look at the list of forged Platonic dialogues in Diog. Laert. III 62, it is of course possible that the *Cimon* might have existed. So Hermann thought that 'Ἀκέφαλοι ἡ' meant »eight dialogues without title«, see Pavlu, Wiener Studien 34 (1912) p. 63. Souilhé, in his edition of the suspected dialogues, reminds us of the fact that Doxopater (Waltz Rhet. II) quotes a dialogue of the name of *Themistocles* and that Arabic sources quote other apocryphic dialogues¹.

Yet, in my opinion, the *Cimon* existed only in the imagination of Herodicus.

καταδρομήν] compare 220 DE.

δν οὐ μόνον] Hypomnematic style, compare the aposiopesis 506 C E and 505 F.

δν Σπεύσιππος φησι] Ἀρχελάω (413—399) is a gloss to Φιλίππῳ and must be cut out or substituted by Περδίκκα. By chance the text is confirmed by a letter from Speusippus, preserved among the Socratic epistulae², whose authenticity has been convincingly proved by Sykutris. The circumstances are the following.

King Amyntas of Macedonia had three sons. Alexander II was killed after three year's reign by a Macedonian nobleman, Ptolemaeus Alorites (ἀλλότριος τοῦ γένους Dexipp. ap. Syncell. 263 B), who for some years reigned as protector. He was put to death by

¹ Also see Zeller II 1⁵, p. 437 n. 1.

² E. Bickermann u. J. Sykutris, *Speusippos' Brief an König Philipp*. Ber. Sächs. Ak. Wiss. 80 (1928). New edition by L. Köhler, *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*, Philol. Suppl. 20, 1928.

506 E Perdiccas III about 365, who in his turn was succeeded by the third brother Philippos II in 359. Perdiccas and Philip seem to have got on well together, which was really very unusual in the Macedonian royal household. During his stay in Thebes Philip became acquainted with Plato, whose political influence and authority outside Athens at this time can hardly be overrated, and who was consulted by various Greek and barbarian rulers in matters of politics. Through his disciple Euphraeus Plato sent a message to Perdiccas in order to induce him to give Philip a province of his own. When Perdiccas was slain in a battle against the Illyrians in 360, Philip is already in possession of a certain power and at once assumes the government. Philip always sustained friendly relations to Plato and the Academy, and after Plato's death Philip bestowed on him funeral honours (ὅφ' οὗ καὶ ἐπιτιμηθῆναι φησιν αὐτὸν Θεόπομπον Diog. Laert. III 40).

In the *Hypomnemata* of Carystius, a contemporary of Herodicus and one of the most irresponsible authors of the biographic literature, the whole story is distorted. In the letter from Speusippus is alleged that Theopompus talked blasphemously of Plato. Carystius simply inserts Philip's name instead of 'Theopompus' — and hocus-pocus a new calumnia is created. Had not the letter from Speusippus been preserved, it would not have been so easy for us to disclose the forgery.

The only astonishing thing in this connection is that Herodicus really expresses his doubt as to this story.

εἶπερ] A bad expression; the interrogative εἶπερ also *Gorg.* 515 B, *Diod.* XVI 2.

καταδρομῆν] The same phrase 220 D, 506 D.

Ἰππίας] Hippias is not mentioned in the *Menexenus*, and the other two are in any case not »treated scornfully«.

507 A Ἐπιλοί δ' ἄν με ἡ ἡμέρα] This rhetorical figure is very old and occurs in various forms, e. g. *Menex.* 239 ὃ τε χρόνος βραχὺς ἀξίως διηγῆσασθαι. We find the phrase in Lysias (12,1), Isocrates (1,11), Demosthenes (18,296) and also in Cicero *de nat. deor.* 3,32 *dies deficiat si velim enumerare*; in Hellenistic literature it is a hackneyed

expression (Plut. *Cic.* 42) and later too (*Ep. Hebr.* 11,32, Aelian *Nat.* 507 A *An.* 8,7). In Athenaeus I have found it 1 B and 20 C, here, and 220 D.

τοῦ σοφοῦ] see the commentary to 504 E.

^{Ἀντισθένην}] Though all mss. including the epitome in this passage read ^{Ἀντισθένη} — otherwise always *ην* in similar names — I suppose the original author wrote or at least spoke ^{Ἀντισθένην}, for else this would be the only hiatus in the chapters 114—115, 506 A—507 A. It is interesting to observe how inconsequent the language is in this respect. If Herodicus had written the whole pamphlet by himself as a result of his own investigations, he would certainly not have worried about hiatus. So the hypomnematic style prevails in the chronological part, and in ch. 55—61 many cases of hiatus are found. But there is no hiatus in ch. 62 (*πεφύκασι*) — 63 (220 E *Ξενοφῶν*), certainly because this passage was taken over from some intermediate source¹. The rest of the essay can roughly be divided into two groups: in 112—113, 116—117 there are a few cases of hiatus, in 114—115 and 118—120 none. There is no use in making too much fuss of this irregularity, but two conclusions may be drawn: a) the author has not taken care in working his material out, b) our suggestion that there are considerable, although concealed remains of the speech of Demochares in Herodicus' essay, is confirmed.

Σάθωνα] see the commentary on 220 D.

^{Ἡγήσανδρος}] Hegesander's work ^{Ῥπομνήματα} must be contemporary with the *Διαδοχαί* of Sotion and is written in the first quarter of the II century B. C. It contained the usual compilation of piquancies and anecdotes. It is impossible to decide if this excerpt was made by Herodicus or Athenaeus. The former seems to me most reasonable with regard to the similarity of contents, the latter is possible because Hegesander's book was one of the few primary sources of Athenaeus.

The anecdotic material in question is treated by Zeller, *Phil. d. Griech.* II: 1⁴ p. 427.

¹ This also explains why there are so many iterations.

507 A B The exact extent of the quotation from Hegesander can be discussed. Among the other fragments of his writings there is only one, *fr.* 32 *FHG* IV 419, dealing with the *κότταβος*-play, that is written in a reasoning, descriptive style. All other fragments are typical anecdotes in the form of apophthegms¹. From stylistic reasons it is, therefore, hardly credible that the direct quotation from Hegesander extends beyond *πρόποσιν*.

Hegesander *fr.* 18, *FHG* IV 417, in Athenaeus 544 C, tells us how Antiphon joked with Aristippus, when the latter visited Dionysius the Elder in Sicily². What though the *mise-en-scène* is quite another here, with our knowledge of the methods of Herodicus it is at least permissible to suspect that his *Ἀρίστιππον ἔσκωπτεν* is a distortion of Hegesander's story.

C *ῥυάκων χάριν*] This is³ the usual word, whilst Diogenes uses the less common *κρατήρων* and after him Olympiodorus *θεασάμενος τοὺς κρατήρας τοῦ πυρός*.

Φαίδωνι] »eine greifbare Lüge«, Zeller II: 1⁴ p. 428 n. 1. Probably it is Epicurean calumnia shifted on to Plato.

ἐνύπνιον] This is obviously a duplicate story, made up through imitation of a well-known word of Socrates, Diog. Laert. III 35, and the dream so often referred to in later literature, Diog. III 5: *λέγεται δ' ὅτι Σωκράτης ὄναρ εἶδε κύκνον νεοττὸν ἐν τοῖς γόνασιν ἔχειν, ὃν καὶ παραχρῆμα πετροφνήσαντα ἀναπτῆναι ἡδὺ κλάγξαντα· καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν Πλάτωνα αὐτῷ συστῆναι, τὸν δὲ τοῦτον εἰπεῖν εἶναι τὸν ὄρνιν* repeated by Apul. *de dogm. Pl.* I 1, Paus. I 30,3, Orig. *c. Cels.* VI 8, Olymp. *v. Pl.* 4, *Prolegg. in Pl.* 1, Suidas s. v. *Πλάτων*, cfr Plut. *de soll. an.* 22,3, Tertull. *de an.* c. 46. In Origen it occurs in this form: *ὁ δὲ βουλόμενος κατηγορεῖν ὡς τερατείας ἱστορουμένης περὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Σωκράτους ἐκθήσεται καὶ τὸν συνιστάμενον Σωκράτει καθ' ὕπνον κύκνον καὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον εἰπόντα ἐπὶ τῇ συστάσει τοῦ νεανίσκου, Οὗτος ἄρα ὁ κύκνος ἦ³*. The adaption to the form of an apophthegm is typical.

¹ On this type of tradition see G. Rudberg, *Zur Diogenestradition*, Symb. Osl. 14 (1925) p. 23.

² So too *schol. in Luc. Menipp.*, p. 273 Jacobitz, p. 172 Rabe.

³ *Contra Cels.* VI 8, *PGM* XI 1301 A.

Διοσκοουρίδης] Another apophthegm by this writer is quoted about **507 D** Solon, Diog. Laert. I 63. Its tendency makes it credible that he is the well-known disciple of Isocrates and enemy of Plato. *Ἐν διαθήκαις* is apparently an abridgement of the original version. If it was shortened by Herodicus or Athenaeus is impossible to decide. The sense is clear: even after death many people show their vanity. They write pompous testaments, they arrange magnificent burials and provide for splendid mausolea. The passage quoted from John Chrysostom offers a good commentary.

δόξης χιτῶνα] Si non é vero é ben trovato. The model is the Homeric *λάινον ἔσασθαι χιτῶνα*, other usages *ἀποδύς τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς χιτῶνα* Apollonphanes ap. Ath. 281 D, and Julian. *Orat.* 2 p. 96 C *τὸν ἔσχατον τὸν τῆς φιλοτιμίας χιτῶνα ἀποδύσασθαι*. The story originates in Stoic moral philosophy and it is possible that the story of Plato's witty answer to Antisthenes, Diog. Laert. II 36 *ὁρῶ σου διὰ τοῦ τρίβωνος τὴν κενοδοξίαν* served as a model.

ζωγράφος] Herodicus as usual unrestrainedly manipulates Plato's **E** words.

5. *Plato's writings and disciples.*

διαπλαττομένη] cfr 508 B.

ἀνάμνησις] Herodicus has given the word a sense contrary to the **F** one in Plato.

ἔστιν] »even if it is really better«, not *εἴη*.

508 B

τοὺς Τιμαίους] Compare Plat. *Conv.* 218 AB; it is an imitation of the exemplifying plural of proper names.

μαθήμασι] The branches of science, especially mathematics, outside ethics and politics. In spite of the fact that the censure of the writings of Plato is expounded here in an utterly abridged, not to say rudimentary form, the disposition is obvious: 1) *τὰ ἐν τοῖς μαθήμασι*, 2) *τὰ κατὰ φύσιν*, 3) *τὰ κατ' ἄνθρωπον*.

508 C *Θεόπομπος*] His pamphlet was the most famous contribution in the great controversy about the meaning of rhetorics between the Isocratean disciples and the Academy. A fragmentary catalogue of a library in Rhodes from about the year 100 B. C.¹ bears evidence of how well-known it was. Possibly two other fragments can be identified as belonging to this pamphlet; one is nr F 275, which is a very unphilosophical contribution to the debate between Plato and Antisthenes on the possibility of defining the Simple and Uncomposed;² the other is F 359, which contains a simple argument against the theory of Ideas. The accusation of plagiarism (*κλοπή*) belongs to the standard invectives.³ Bryson is mentioned by Iamblichus *Vita Pyth.* 23 as one of those youngsters who were instructed by Pythagoras in his old age, cfr below 509 c. Aristotle rebukes an utterance of his.⁴ The fragment of Ehipphus 509 C shows us that the calumnia had followed the usual route by way of the comedy.

D *ζητοῦμεν*] Herodicus remarks that Plato has written no systematic ethics.

πολλοὶ τῶν μαθητῶν] To belittle a great man by showing up the incompetence of his disciples is an ancient method of warfare. So Aeschines in his dialogue *Callias*, Ath. 220 B, demonstrated that Prodicus and Anaxagoras were worthless teachers because they had inferior disciples.

E *Εὐφραῖος*] mentioned above in the commentary to 506 E. After a long sojourn in Macedonia he deserted Philip in 342 and put himself at the head of the anti-macedonian party at Oreos⁵, where he was slain in 341 when that city was occupied by Parmenio.

γεωμετρεῖν] A standing argument, most amusingly used by the master storyteller Plutarch in *Dio* 13, p. 963 C *φορὰ δέ τις ἦν ἐπὶ*

¹ *Fr Gr Hist* 115, T 48.

² E. Rohde, *Rhein. Mus.* 48 (1893) 114. According to Diog. Laert. VI 14 Antisthenes was the only Socratic whom Theopompus approved of. They met in their common hatred of Plato.

³ E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griech. Literatur*, Leipzig 1912. In 507 E Kaibel has suggested the reading *κεκλεμμένων* but I do not think he is right.

⁴ *Rhet.* III 2, 13. Praechter, *Phil. d. Allertums*¹² p. 462.

⁵ Demosth. IX 60, cfr U. Kahrstedt, *Forsch. zur Griech. Gesch.* 1910, p. 72.

λόγους καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπάντων καὶ τὸ τυραννεῖον ὥς φασι κονιορτὸς ὑπὸ πλήθους τῶν γεωμετρούντων κατεῖχεν.

Κάλλιππος] We learn from the same source ch. 54, that Callippus **508 E** οὐκ ἀπὸ παιδείας ἀλλ' ἐκ μυσταγωγῶν καὶ τῆς περιτρεχούσης ἑταιρείας γνῶριμον αὐτῷ (sc. Δίῳ) γενέσθαι καὶ συνήθη. Unscrupulous as usual Herodicus makes him a disciple of Plato.

Εὐαίῳ] He was according to Diog. Laert. III 46 a native of Lam- **F** psacus and disciple of Plato. The Academic Eurypylus, of Cos like his namesake the fabulous king, has written about him and is quoted by Dicaeocles (III cent. B. C.), whose words are preserved through Numenius in Eusebius' *Praep. Evang.* XV 731 C Δικαιοκλῆς¹ ὁ Κνίδιος ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Διατριβαῖς. The anti-platonic tendency of the *Διατριβαί* is evident in both fragments preserved.

ἀφυστερησάσης] καὶ ἀφυστερησάσης is the text of the epitome. With personal subject the verb is rather common, for instance Polyb. XXII 5,2. But what would be the sense of it in this passage? The context postulates »as he did not get his money back in time«. Although I have found no parallel to the phrase (τῆς πόλεως) ἀφυστερησάσης in this sense, I hesitatingly accepted this reading.

Τιμόλαος] All the manuscripts have *Τίμαιος*, Diog. Laert. III 46 **509 A** has *Τιμόλαος*, and this form also occurs in Philodemus, if we accept Spengel's interpretation of the papyrus. In the margin of *col.* VI 12 there is a notice, which although very difficult to decipher, seems to contain the words *Τίμαιον λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ* (something illegible; it is hardly allowed to suggest *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην*).

ὁ αὐτὸς *Δημοχάρης*] justifies the opinion that the whole passage about the disciples of Plato was taken over from the speech of Demochares.

Ἀρριδαῖος] not *Ἀρριβαῖος* as Droysen conjectured, see Kaerst *RE* II 1249 and Beloch III: 1 p. 100.

τοιούτοι δ' εἰσὶ] compare the commentary to 215 C.

¹ Διοκλῆς is the reading of the MSS., corrected by Wilamowitz, *Antigonos* p. 313.

509 A καὶ νῦν] »still». This word cannot possibly be regarded as anything but a remainder from the speech of Demochares, and I cannot understand why Wilamowitz in his discussion of the passage, *Antigonos* 196, brackets this word. Further it should be stressed that the Academics are being assaulted, not only the successors of Aristotle. I am of course aware that, at this early time, no great difference was made between Ἀκαδημαϊκός and Περιπατητικός¹, between the Academy and the Lyceum. Wilamowitz thinks that only Aristotle's followers were prosecuted and he had some difficulty in explaining the ecloga from Alexis' Ἰππος (II 327 K) preserved by Athenaeus 610 E together with a short account of the decree proposed by Sophocles.

Τοῦτ' ἔστιν Ἀκαδήμεια, τοῦτο Ξενοκράτης.
 Πολλ' ἀγαθὰ δοῖεν οἱ θεοὶ Δημητρίῳ
 καὶ τοῖς νομοθέταις, διότι τοὺς τὰς τῶν λόγων,
 ὧς φασι, δυνάμεις παραδιδόντας τοῖς νέοις
 ἐς κόρακας ἐρρίψασιν ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς.

Alexis has, it will be remembered, made merry over Plato and the Academy in many comedies, Ἀγκυλίων, DL III 27, Μερσις, ib. III 27, Ὀλυμπιόδωρος, ib. III 28, Παράσιτος, Ath. 421 D, Μίκκων, Ath. 354 D, and probably many others. He reached the age of about 100 years; some of the comedies were written in Plato's lifetime, presumably in the 'fifties, but there is one fragment showing that he produced plays as late as 288. In one play Δημήτριος ἢ Φιλεταῖρος he shows himself as a great admirer of Demetrius. In the ecloga quoted above Demetrius Poliorcetes and the committee of the νομοθέται are praised because they expelled the philosophers who taught the youth the »power of eloquence». Every Athenian knew from his own history and his own experience that λόγον δύναμις τυγχάνει ψυχᾶγωγία οἶσα.² The great public does not care about subtleties. One hundred years earlier Socrates had to run the gauntlet; he was elected a representative of all contemporary philosophers and sophists, on to his shoulders was thrown the animosity against all the others, not only the celebrities but also the petty geniuses,

¹ See my paper *Aristoteles och idéläran*, *Eranos* 35 (1938) p. 144.

² *Phaedr.* 271 CD.

and he had to pay with his life. Thus it is no wonder that now **509 A** the Academy, the worthy Xenocrates together with the actual head of the Lyceum, Theophrastus, who was in reality very popular among the Athenians, were put in the loop-hole.

I am convinced that the first τοῦτ' ἔστιν Ἀκαδήμεια, τοῦτο Ξενοκράτης concluded an exposition of the shortcomings of the contemporary philosophers in general; then follows an expression of gratitude towards Poliorcetes, who released the city of these seducers of the youth. This view is confirmed by the fact that the contemporary head of the Academy and many of its adherents were men of quite another intellectual and moral standard than the old heroes, Plato, Xenocrates and Speusippus, and afterwards very badly slashed by the peripatetic biographers.

In 306 Polemo was scholarch. According to the slander reported by Diogenes he had in his youth been dissolute and extravagant. IV 16 νέος δ' ὢν ἀκόλαστός τε καὶ διακεχυμένος ἦν οὕτως ὥστε καὶ περιφέρειν ἀργύριον πρὸς τὰς ἐτοίμους λύσεις τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς στενοποῖς ἔκρουπτεν κτλ. Antigonus wrote a vivid description of his lechery preserved by Philodemus.¹ Antigonus is no liar; there must be some truth in the story. Polemo's contemporary was Clearchus of Soloi, in later literature styled Peripatetic, but this should not deceive us. He belonged to the Academy and wrote a Πλάτωνος ἐγκώμιον, but is better known through his compilations full of erotic and biographic piquancies. Further there is the queer Heraclides of Pontus, who according to Diogenes V 86 ἐσθῆτι τε μαλακῇ ἐχρῆτο καὶ ὑπέρογκος ἦν τὸ σῶμα.

All these late Academics — and there were certainly many *dii minores* — were διὰ γοητείας περιβλεπτοί, ostentatiously conspicuous through their legerdemain. They quarrelled with and plagiarized one another.

The hatred of Demochares and the Athenian mob was thus directed against the Academy as well as the Peripatetic school. According to our sources all philosophers were temporarily expelled from Athens.

ἀνοσίως βιοῦντες] Philodem. col. XV 20, p. 56 Mekler: ἔφη δ' ἐν ἅσται τόθ' ὑπάρχεν παρ' ἐνίοις ἀσώτοις σιτήσεις, ἢν' ἀκολασίας ἀφιστῶσαν τοὺς ἐφήβους τῆς Ἀκαδημίας τε καὶ κώθωνος ἀποχῆς κτλ.

¹ *Academ. Philos. Index Hercul.* p. 47 Mekler.

509 B *Χαίρων*] Here too Philodemus transcribes Antigonus, *col. XI*, p. 28 Mekler: . . . *Πελληνέως τοῦ Χαίρωνος, ἐπειδήπερ οὐθὲν ἐνποδὼν ἔστι, παραθετόν αἱ κατεχώρισεν Ἑρμιππος ἐν τῷ Περί τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας εἰς ἀριστείας καὶ δυναστείας μεθεστηκότων. Χαίρων δ' ὁ Πελληνεὺς ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ μὲν παρὰ Πλάτωνι καὶ Ξενοκράτει οὐκ ἔμεινεν ἀλλὰ νενικηκῶς δις πάλην* (tells of his victories). *αὐτὸν δὲ μετὰ τούτου καὶ τῶν ἐμ Πελοποννήσῳ στρατιωτῶν κατασχόντα τὴν πατρίδα τοὺς μὲν πολίτας ἐγβαλεῖν, τοῖς δούλοις δὲ τὰ κτήματά τε τῶν δεσποτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας δοῦναι. Φαινίας δ' αὐτὸν λέγει φιλότιμον ἐμ πλεονεξίᾳ γενόμενον καὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπικῆς νίκης οὐ κατ' ἀξίαν τύραννον ἀναφανῆναι θεατρικόν. ἐπιχειρήσαι δέ τινες αὐτὸν λέγουσι καὶ πόλιν κτίσαι Χαιρώνειαν* (not the famous one) *ἐγγὺς τῶν καλουμένων Μεγαρικῶν κτλ.* In this report there are several sources discernible: a) Chaeron was a disciple of Plato and Xenocrates, whom he however deserted; he brought about a violent change in government in Pellene and gave the property and the women of the aristocrats to the slaves. This comes from Demochares' speech. b) His various athletic victories, also recorded by Pausanias VII 27,7, c) The report of Phaenias; probably in his work entitled *Τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας*. Phaenias was a contemporary of Demochares and belonged to the same literary coterie as Theophrastus, Dicaearchus and Aristoxenus.¹ d) The anonymous report on the foundation of Chaeronea, perhaps from Antigonus. Philodemus explicitly states that he has taken over the whole material from Hermippus, who *κατεχώρισεν* all this. This word, meaning »enter in a register«, is very typical; just so Hermippus recorded his material which he gathered where he could.

παρανόμων Νόμων] betrays the insipid rhetor, as Wilamowitz remarks. These oxymora at first appear in Aeschylus² who exaggerates the use of them — it was apparently a fresh invention — more sparsely in Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes³ and are afterwards always a popular although very dangerous instrument of *ψυχαγωγία*.

¹ Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography* p. 133, on good reasons regards these four men as pioneers in the field of literary biography.

² πόρος ἄπορος, πόλεμος ἀπόλεμος, νᾶες ἄναες, χάρις ἄχαρις, παῖδες ἄπαιδες.

³ *Oed. tyr.* 1213 ἄγαμον γάμον, *Hec.* 948 γάμος οὐ γάμος *Plut.* 969 βίος ἀβίωτος (imitated by Accius in *Medea, vita invita*).

Who inserted this very suitable ecloga from Ehippus? Hege- 509 C sander, Herodicus, Phavorinus or Athenaeus?

Athenaeus in his great work added a considerable number of similar eclogas from the writers of comedias. His assertion 336 D, however, must be regarded as a gross exaggeration: *πλείονα τῆς μέσης κωμωδίας ἀναγνούς δράματα τῶν ὀκτακοσίων καὶ τούτων ἐκλογὰς ποιησάμενος*. The old and middle comedy was studied, interpreted and excerpted by numerous scholars from about 200 B. C. Great lexica of *Κωμωδοῦμενοι* were arranged, anthologies were compiled and extracts for various purposes were made by numerous writers. With Didymus, in the reign of Augustus, the great compilations of various contents, arranged *κατὰ στοιχεῖον*, i. e. in alphabetical order, came into existence: we know titles and possess fragments of many of these huge compilations, comparable to the great encyclopædias of our time. Athenaeus first and foremost used these encyclopædias as sources, not the original works. If he deals with e. g. wine and wine-drinking he searches his lexica for suitable extracts. So he often makes lucky hits, which put him in a very favourable light as a man of great reading and wit.

But the surrounding words which he must add to introduce the ecloga or to find a transition betray him. In passages where he himself indisputably handles his pen, his prose is affected, crabbed and rich in hiatus. I cannot find another example of a commenting introduction by his hand like the one here.

So I do not think Athenaeus has added this ecloga. It can hardly be Phavorinus — who has added some other notes — because he is always anxious to defend Plato. Thus in the end we have to choose between Herodicus, who always displays a rather bad taste, and the witty Hegesander. I suppose it is the latter; Herodicus has taken it over from his *ῥπομνήματα*.

ἀργυρίῳ συκοφαντοῦντας] is a paraphrase of *πληγὴς ἀνάγκη*.

ἡσκοῦντο] cfr Luc. *Imagin.* II νεὼς ἡσκημένος.

τέχνη συνόν] ought to be combined, cfr *ἡδοναῖς συνεῖναι* Plat. *Rep.* 586 B.

509 C ὑπὸ Πλάτωνα] so of inferiors in a military sense, Xen. *Cyrif.* V 3,47, a στρατηγός ought to know all τῶν ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν (in our editions erroneously often ἑαυτῷ) ἡγεμόνων ὀνόματα cfr I, 5,3.

ὑποπλατωνικός] as Meineke and -ων as Wilamowitz recommend, would, I suppose, mean »something a little (or nearly) Platonic», cfr ὑπαττικός Tim. *Sill.* 25,3 Diels (50 W.).

Βρυσωνο-] »hunting for copper like Bryson and Thrasymachus». Bryson from Heraclea is presumably the father of the famous argument of the τρίτος ἄνθρωπος. Alex. Aphrod. p. 84,16 Hayduck says that Polyxenus (thus not Bryson, as is alleged by Natorp *RE* III 927 and others) introduced this argument, but this Polyxenus was a disciple of Bryson. Thrasymachus is hardly the Chalcedonian but the Megarian, of whom Diog. Laert. speaks II 113, as is suggested by Th. Bergk, *Fünf Abh. z. Gesch. der griech. Philos. und Astr.*, Leipzig 1883, cfr Bäumker *Rhein. Mus.* 34 (1879) p. 64.

Herwerden *Anal. crit.* 36,7 suggests rather too ingeniously ὑπὸ Πλατωνικοβρυσωνοθρασυμαχειοληγικερμάτου πληγείς ἀνάγκης. These enormous words belong to the old comedy, especially to the language of Aristophanes, who concludes his *Ecclesiazusae* with a huge monstrum of a word, probably record of the world.

In popular opinion Plato and his disciples were put on a level with the sophists who received payment for their instruction, and with the eristics; Isocrates did his best to create disdain of the Platonic school, οἱ περὶ τὰς ἔριδας διατρέβοντες, *c. soph.* 291. So θρασυμαχειο- probably has a double sense. It contains the name of a well-known sophist and it alludes to the fights of the eristics.

D The refined clothing and pompous demeanour of the Academy — of course exaggerated in reverse proportion to age and wisdom among the younger Academics — was the common talk of the contemporary public, as the following passage from Antiphanes shows¹:

A. ὦ τάν, κατανοεῖς τίς ποτ' ἐστὶν οὗτοσί
ὁ γέρων; B. ἀπὸ τῆς μὲν ὄψεως Ἑλληνικός.
λευκὴ χλανίς, φαιὸς χιτωνίσκος καλός,
πιλίδιον ἀπαλόν, εὖροθμος βακτηρία,
βαϊὰ τε πέζα. τί μακρὰ δεῖ λέγειν; ὅλως
αὐτὴν ὁρᾷν γὰρ τὴν Ἀκαδήμειαν δοκῶ.

¹ Athen. 544 A, II 23, Kock.

ὑποκαθεῖς] cfr *barbam promittere*.

509 D

ὑπὸ σφυρόν] The preserved text runs as follows: ὑπὸ ξυρόν κνήμης ἱμάντων ἰσομέτροις ἐλίγμασιν. There must be some bad corruption which is very difficult to correct without considerable emendations.

In ὑπὸ ξυρόν one has tried to find a participle, but none of the words suggested fit to the metre, neither the word one misses here, ὑποσφίγγων. Other suggestions are ὑποξυρόν (impossible throughout) or ὑποξύων (a little better) κνήμας ἱματίων ἐλίγμασι. But three objections can be raised against this solution: a) the man is draped in a χλανίς¹, consequently very elegantly attired. b) Thus it is impossible to equip him with two ἱμάτια. c) The folds of clothes cannot reasonably be styled ἐλίγματα, which refers to some kind of knots, net work, or plaited work.

In ξυρόν we might be inclined to find the word indicating the broad leather strap across the foot, ξυρόν, but we get no nearer an acceptable solution this way, as κνήμης remains unexplained. In this word I for my part see an original gloss to σφυρόν. This gloss has displaced the original participle which is now lost. Until a better solution is presented, I suggest to read

ὑπὸ σφυρόν
δήσας ἱμάντας ἰσομέτροις ἐλίγμασιν.

There is no connecting δέ as in v. 11 σχῆμ' ἀξιώχρεων ἐπικαθεῖς βακτηρία.

ἀλλότριον] τὸ σχῆμα. He appeared as a stranger like the old man in Antiphanes' ecloga quoted above.

¹ Defined as λεπτόν ἱμάτιον by Hesych., Arist. *Eccl.* 848, Ephipp., *fr.* 19, II 261 K.

III. THE TREATISE ΠΕΡΙ ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΩΝ

Even a cursory perusal of the chapters V 1—20 shows that we have before us remnants of writings by the same author who wrote the essay *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην*. Just as so often elsewhere in the work of Athenaeus, his name is mentioned towards the end and, as it were, occasionally and by the way: 192 B *φησὶν δ' Ἡρόδικος*. A closer inspection reveals the following typical traits, in the presentation of which I follow the order adopted in my edition of the fragments.

- 1) The purpose is to make a comparison of convivial customs, as depicted by
 - a) Homer,
 - b) Plato, Xenophon and Epicurus,
 - c) as prevalent in the author's own time (193 A *οὐχ ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς*, 193 C *οἱ δὲ νῦν*, 185 C *τῶν δὲ νῦν δειπνῶν*, 191 E *καὶ νῦν δὴ νόμος*).

There is an additional note 191 F *καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις*.

- 2) There is a clear anti-platonic tendency throughout the whole treatise:
 - a) 177 A, 192 A. In Plato all kinds of guests are invited to the banquet, and there is a general disorder and confusion. Homer on the contrary teaches us what people should be invited.
 - b) 178 CD. Plato has misinterpreted Homer, *Conv.* 174 B; the Homeric heroes are no cowards.
 - c) 180 A. Plato's banquet is a revel, a *συνπόσιον* in the true sense of the word, with immoderate drinking, while the heroes in Homer are abstemious.
 - d) 182 A. Plato's banquet is frequented by sneerers and mockers (*μυκτηρισταί*); in Homer we always find a selected party of distinguished men.

- e) 187 C-F. The general tone of conversation in Plato is rude, boorish and uneducated, rich in abusive words against individuals or against Athens. Paederasty is censured. Yet Homer was expelled from the Ideal State (compare 505 B); a proverb of Demochares is quoted (compare 215 C). On the contrary the young men in Homer are paragons of virtue.
- 3) We often meet a magisterial *διδάσκει* "Ομηρος, 185 B, 186 F, 177 C, 179 B bis, 179 E, 191 D. Besides there are other expressions such as *πολλῶ κάλλιον ἐποίησε*, and so on. It is on the whole evident that to the author of this treatise Homer is the Great Teacher.
- 4) There are many verbal concordances between this treatise and the essay *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην*.
 { 187 C τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην παράγει λέγοντα ὅτι πασχητιᾷ
 { 219 B Ἀλκιβιάδῃ συνεκοιμήθη
 { 506 C τὰ κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου λεχθέντα σιωπῶ
 { 182 A τὸν περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου λόγον σιωπῶ
 187 D ~ 505 B, 188 D ~ 508 D.

The style is simple. Its characteristic features are easier to perceive than to describe. I should call it a natural, unpretentious *ἀφέλεια*. Paratactic co-ordination is the rule and only the most common particles occur, *καί*, *δέ*, *ἀλλά* and especially *γούν*¹. Subordinate clauses are rare; there are few temporal clauses but proportionally more relative clauses; the author particularly loves *ὅπερ*² and makes an immoderate use of *καίπερ*. The author's negligence is manifest; there are often unnecessary repetitions, a common thing in hypomnematic works of literature.³

One section of the treatise is a very good guide as to the time of its composition. It is 185 C *τῶν δὲ νῦν δείπνων προνοοῦντες οἱ νομοθεταὶ κτλ.*, and it is therefore necessary to insert a short comment on this chapter here.

¹ 107, 8; 108, 1, 5; 110, 3, 9, 13; 115, 12; 116, 6; 117, 13; 123, 6; 124, 4.

² 107, 1, 10, 12; 118, 1.

³ *δεῖ γάρ* 116, 11, 13. *ἀλλ'* 119, 4, 5. *ὁμιλοῦσι* 123, 5, 14. *καὶ νῦν* — *καὶ παρ'* 124, 8.

Among the Heliasts a certain committee, appointed by drawing lots, performed the duties of sworn νομοθέται;¹ they revised laws and ordinances so far as this was not done on the first assembly of the year. The Athenian people was from time immemorial as σύσσιτοι closely joined in religious guilds and confraternities of different kinds; φράτορας ἐσσιᾶν was a regular duty. We know very little in detail about these guilds.² The members were called θιασῶται, ὀργεῶνες or ἐρανισταί, and ἐστίασις was the general form of these meetings.³ Most ancient are the φυλετικὰ δεῖπνα mentioned here, which formed part of the ἐγκύκλιοι λειτουργίαι, according to Demosth. *Lept.* 21. If only the members of a φρατρία gathered — they called themselves γεννῆται — the banquets were called φρατρικὰ δεῖπνα.⁴ From the noble families of the Eupatrides spread the custom of coming together in order to celebrate common banquets, and probably it is these banquets accessible to the great public that were called δημοτικά⁵. The term ὀργεωνικά must of course be derived from ὄργια, the partakers of which were called ὀργεῶνες and their festivals were called ὀργεωνικαὶ σύνοδοι⁶. Whether the ὀργεῶν was bound to a certain secret rite, a certain trade or class in society or not, remains undecided. Finally θίασος, it is true, originates in the Bacchic cult, but later on it is the most common word for religious guilds in general and for the banquets accompanying the cult.⁷ The different guilds had their names from the object of the cult. Thus we have the Εἰκαδεῖς⁸, Σαραπισταί, Ἡροῦσταί, Διονυσιασταί and so on.

¹ Demosth. in *Timocr.* 27, Andoc. *Myster.* 84.

² Collected in the well-known books by E. Ziebarth, *Das Griechische Vereinswesen*, Leipzig 1896, and F. Poland, *Gesch. des griech. Vereinswesen*, Leipzig 1909.

³ Read the chapter «Rechtliche Stellung der Philosophenschulen» in Wilamowitz, *Antigonos* p. 264.

⁴ Compare Dionys. Hal. II 23.

⁵ The meaning of this word is evolved by Aristotle *Pol.* VI 2,8 p. 1317 b 40 sqq.

⁶ *IG* 2², 2361, 14, III A. D.

⁷ Cfr Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 44 p. 301 F τῷ Ποσειδῶνι θυσίαν ἄγονσι τοὺς καλουμένους θιάσους, ἐν ᾗ καθ' αὐτοὺς ἀφ' ἡμέρας ἐκαδέκα μετὰ σιωπῆς ἐστιῶνται, δοῦλος δ' οὐ πάρεστιν. Of Cleomenes Plutarch says 821 A ἐν γυναιξὶ καὶ θιάσοις καὶ κόμοις συνέχοντος ἐαυτὸν. The use of the word in this general sense is early.

⁸ With a witty distortion the Epicureans were called Εἰκαδισταί, because they commemorated their founder's death on the twentieth of Gamelion, Ath. VII 53, 298 D. See Dittenberger's *Sylloge* III p. 246 ff.

Now in this chapter we hear of the *σύνοδοι* of the followers of the three well-known Stoic philosophers, Diogenes of Seleucia, called the Babylonian, who participated in the famous embassy of philosophers to Rome in 156/55, further his successor as scholarch, Antipater of Tarsus, and finally Panaetius of Rhodes, who succeeded Antipater in 129. About 150 B. C. all these philosophers lectured at the same time in Athens, Diogenes more than 80 years old¹ and Panaetius about 35 years old, thus at his *ἀκμή*. This must be a *terminus post quem* for our treatise. Panaetius died in 112, and shortly afterwards Poseidonius won his great fame as *princeps Stoicorum* by completely remodelling the philosophy of the school. After about the year 100 B. C. it is by no means probable that followers of the three old philosophers, who had now been dead for a long time and whose doctrines were already obsolete, met at regular *σύνοδοι*.²

It must however be particularly stressed, that Herodicus here uses the word *σύνοδοι*, a term of very general sense, to imply that followers of the three great philosophers gathered for meetings. It is not mentioned whether these meetings were coupled with any kind of cult. Yet it is impossible to suppose that they met to celebrate the memory of the three teachers, as was the case with the Epicureans. This is moreover emphasized by the comparison with Theophrastus. His nearest disciples used to meet regularly, while he was scholarch in the Lyceum, and in his testament he provided that certain disciples, who were mentioned by name, should have the right to dispose of his property and his home.³ For their meetings he prescribed certain rules, *συμποτικὸι νόμοι*.

To sum it up, it seems to me most likely that these *σύνοδοι* took place at the time when the fame of the three philosophers was at its height and followers and personal disciples were still alive, that is to say between 150 and 130. Since Herodicus uses the word in this

¹ Pseud.-Luc. *Macrob.* 20; in Cicero's *Cato Maior* 23 it is presumed that he has just died, but it is of course impossible to use this literary fiction to support an exact statement of his death.

² M. Müller, *De Seleuco Homérico*, D. Gött. 1891, p. 11, and after him Gudeman in *RE* VIII 973 and other authors of handbooks mean, that since these banquets are not mentioned by Cicero, it is not probable that they survived the catastrophe of the year 86 B. C. But this is a negative argument of no value at all. Furthermore Müller and his followers have wrongly understood *σύνοδοι* as *collegia*.

³ See the *testimonia ad locum*.

description, he talks of contemporary occurrences. The epigram against the Aristarcheans seems to have been written some time after 146. Thus both these determinations of time point towards the same period; this treatise and the epigram can be assigned to the year 145 B. C. At any rate I conclude without hesitation, that the treatise *Περὶ στυμπιοσίων* was written between 150 and 140.

The chapters V 1—20 in Athenaeus are not a continuous and coherent treatise by Herodicus without any additions. The question is not so easy. There are some sections, the style and contents of which seem to betray another author or another source. I now follow the order in Kaibel's edition of Athenaeus.

1) *The prooemium of Athenaeus*, p. 403,20—404,5.

In a paper on the character of Athenaeus¹ I have tried to define his methods of work from a more general point of view. Here I shall only call to mind how he usually composes his introductions and clusters of quotations. As I have previously pointed out, Athenaeus very seldom used the original works of a classical author. His principal sources were the great compilations, lexica and the hypomnematic literature from Didymus onwards up to his own time. How does he work out an introduction?

Before him he has spread out the material he intends to excerpt. He selects a few catchwords and stock phrases suitable for his theme, mixes them into some simple introductory words, and chooses — apparently with great skill — some suitable verses from a comic poet or other current quotations which contain or allude to the catchwords. I stress «apparently», for there is no reason to believe that Athenaeus himself, as he wishes to give out 336 D, read through hundreds of comedies and personally excerpted and collected these quotations. He has at his disposal the great grammatical lexica of his time and there he looks up the catchwords in question and finds the wanted eclogues and poetical excerpts. He has familiarized himself with this style and this manner of work to such a degree,

¹ Cited above p. 57.

that he can hardly write a single sentence himself without either borrowing some rare words (220 F πόθων θέλγητρα) or interlarding his text with quotations (222 D καὶ ἡμεῖς).

Athenaeus dedicates his book to Timocrates¹ who is apostrophized now and then in his prooemia and in the text; he also makes up a rudimentary dialogue between the learned banqueters. Kaibel, and with him many others, thought that our existing copy of the work of Athenaeus is an abridged edition of the original work, which was supposed to contain comprehensive dialogic parts. This hypothesis however is decidedly wrong. We are in many cases able to see how totally indifferent Athenaeus was to the outward form of his work; the most typical example is 556 B, where we can observe how Athenaeus himself — for nobody would dare to vindicate that this be the work of an epitomist — deliberately mingles the three styles and the three conceptions on which his great work is built up: a) the frame-dialogue, i. e. the pretended dialogue, often in epistolary form, between himself and Timocrates, b) the rudimentary inner dialogue between the banqueters, and c) the purely narrative style.²

We may compare the prooemium of book XIII. Again we find Timocrates as well as one of the banqueters, Larensius ὁ ἐστιάτωρ, and some quotations in narrative style in preparation of the coming theme; as catchwords *περὶ γαμικῶν καὶ ἐταιρῶν λόγος*. Compare also the speech of Cynulcus IV 45—50 or the prooemium of book VI.

Here in the prooemium of book V we have the usual ingredients:

- a) Timocrates is apostrophized, frame-dialogue.
- b) Masurius is represented as speaking, inner dialogue.
- c) The theme is given in a couple of catch-words, *λόγος περὶ συμποσίων* and *τὰ χορησιμώτατα* (compare the repeated *διδάσκει* of Herodicus) *ἅπερ ὁ θεῖος* (the epithet is typical of the style of Athenaeus, see the commentary to p. 504 E) *Ὀμηρος παραιογήγαγε*.
- d) A suitable quotation from Agathon.

¹ Since everything in Athenaeus is artificial and over-refined one is tempted to ask, if he has not invented this person after the model of the Epicurean, Plut. *adv. Colot.* 31, 1125 D οὐδὲν οὖν δεῖ τοῦς Ἑλληνας σφῆξεν, ἀλλ' ἐσθλὴν καὶ πίνειν, ὃ Τιμόκρατες, ἀβλαβῶς τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ κεχαρισμένως,

² Παρέθετο (narrative style) δὲ περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν ψήφισμα Ἰερώννυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος ὅπερ σοι διαπέμφομαι (frame-dialogue) εὐπορήσας τοῦ βιβλίου. ἀντεῖπε . . . Παναίτιος (inner dialogue). See *op. cit.* (above p. 57) p. 239.

2) *P.* 407,²⁴ — 410,²¹.

Both chapters 4—5 contain a discussion of *Il. B* 408—409, and it is a very intricate question to decide to whom the different sections belong. Müller, in his dissertation cited above p. 93, thinks that it is an addition made by Athenaeus himself, who would then have independently excerpted all these sources and compiled these chapters. This is quite unreasonable, especially when we consider what we know of the methods of work of Athenaeus.

I distinguish the following sections.

a) Ἐδίδαξεν δ' Ὀμηρος — ἄφιλον. This section indubitably belongs to the treatise of Herodicus and corresponds to 406,¹⁵ ἐκδιδάσκει τίνας κλητέον. It must be observed that the whole section from 186 F ἔπειτα to 177 C αὐτόματος — Μενέλαος deals with the five continuous verses *Il. B* 404—408.

b) Ἠλάτων δὲ — end of ch. 5. This section is coherent for the quotations from Bacchylides and the proverbs are firmly anchored. The scholium to *Conv.* 174 B can apparently be traced back to this combination of quotations, but unfortunately the date of this scholium is not known, although it is certainly late. Nevertheless it is not probable that the scholiast obtained his material through Athenaeus; there are at least no other traces of such a use. According to my opinion, therefore, Athenaeus found the whole of this passage, that is to say the whole treatise by Herodicus including its later additions, in some later grammatical or lexical compilation. The scholiast of Plato has probably hit upon the same source, which is quite natural, as scholia in general are nothing but extracts from these relatively late compilations.

The problem of the authorship of this section cannot be solved that way. If we look at the contents, it seems to me very credible that Herodicus is the author. He could not reasonably find anything in Plato, the object of his hatred, about τίνας οὐ δεῖ καλεῖν. As a matter of fact he has construed this »prescription» of Homer in order to get an opportunity of criticizing Plato. In this case the insertion of the quotation from Homer serves as a foil to what he really wants to say himself — the calumny of Plato and the other philosophers. The quotation from Bacchylides¹ he has inserted in

¹ In the same way he quotes Aristophanes 179 B and — if it belongs to the treatise — Pindar 191 F.

order to show that *αὐτόματοι* are the same as *δίκαιοι φῶτες* and not *χείρονες*. Proverbs are used as arguments also 187 A.

Although I dare not deny the possibility that what we see stored in this section is later grammatical wisdom, I want to lay stress on the fact that there are good reasons to believe that Herodicus is the author and that it originally formed part of his treatise on convivial customs.

c) The remaining section, 408,5—409,7, deals with verse *B* 409. In my opinion it contains Seleucus' discussion of this passage and is a polemic against Aristarchus. To understand that, we must look at the scholium to *B* 408—409. **A** has nothing, **B** and **T** give us the following explanation.

408. τὸν γὰρ (**B** *peius* δὲ) ἀδελφὸν οὐδὲ ἐκάλεσεν, ἀλλ' αὐτόματος ἦλθεν.

409. ἦδε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὡς ἐπονεῖτο· ἅμα δὲ διδάσκει συμφέρεσθαι (**T** *συμπεριφέρεσθαι*, cfr *συμπεριφερόμενος* 177 D) τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν σχολαῖς. καὶ ἵνα μὴ δόξη ἐπιλελῆσθαι (cfr *ἐπιλαθέσθαι* 177 E) αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀδελφός, αὐτόματος ἐρχεται, ἀπαλλάσσειν ἐκείνον ὡς πονούμενος τοῦ ἐγκλήματος.

The conformity with our passage is obvious. We have before our eyes the exegesis of Aristarchus and this is also confirmed by 177 E *μᾶλλον Ἀριστάρχον κατακούων τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν ἐπῶν*. But who «understood the passage better than Aristarchus»?

The Aristarchean conception of the passage is criticized by Seleucus: if Menelaus, as Homer says (so this *φησὶν* must be interpreted), knew that Agamemnon was occupied, he would of course have arrived without an invitation. The added verse is unnecessary (*γελοῖον*). Thus Seleucus interprets the passage just as Aristarchus does, but he regrets that the latter has not drawn the obvious conclusions of his interpretation and rejected this verse as spurious. As a support he relates the opinions of Athenocles and Demetrius. There the commentary on *B* 409 ends, and with the quotation from Plato we come back to the theme *τίνας οὐ κλητέον*.

3) *P*. 413,24—417,2.

The first words of the chapter evidently belong to the treatise of Herodicus; with the clumsy *οὗ ἐν τῇ γαμοποιίᾳ* begins an obvious insertion, whose author criticizes the verses δ 17—19

τερπόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς
 φορμίζων· δοιὼ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτούς
 μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντες ἐδίνεον κατὰ μέσσους

as transposed from Σ 604 (μετενεγκόντες ἐκ τῆς Ὀπλοποιίας). So also the scholia state: *φασὶ τοὺς γ' στίχους τούτους μὴ εἶναι Ὀμήρου ἀλλὰ τοῦ Ἀριστάρχου*. But Dindorf, who mistakenly reads τοὺς ε' στίχους, tells us that the scholium in **MT** was written in such a manner that the suspicion arises, that some reader of our passage in Athenaeus may afterwards have inserted this observation among the old scholia. At any rate it is of secondary value.

Müller has shown that the section 413,²⁴—417,² was written by Seleucus and has also discussed its textual difficulties.¹ The contradiction between 188 B ἐν γαμικῷ συμποσίῳ διατρίβοντες (compare 185 B) and the tendency of this section, which is to show that there is no reference at all to wedding ceremonies, clearly indicates that this section was added after the composition of the treatise of Herodicus. This contradiction also makes it extremely improbable that it was Seleucus who himself inserted this observation in the text of Herodicus.² Apart from other circumstances it is reasonable to assume that he would have inserted a similar reservation also in 188 B. A third unknown person, hardly Athenaeus himself, effected the amalgamation by changing Ἐν δὲ τῇ γαμοποιίᾳ to οὗ ἐν τῇ γαμοποιίᾳ.

Seleucus makes three remarks in his criticism of the text of Aristarchus:

a) εἰς τὸ τοῦ Μενελάου συμπόσιον ἐμβαλὼν οὗς οὐ προσήκει στίχους, namely δ 17—19.

b) τῆς Λακωνίων παιδείας ἀλλότριον ἐποίησε.

To this belongs also the general reflexion διάφορος ἦν ἡ μουσικὴ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι, which Müller picks out as a separate addition.

c) τοῦ Κρητικοῦ χοροῦ τὸν ῥόδον ἐξεῖλεν, by taking away 604 μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς φορμίζων. The consequence was that Aristarch misinterpreted ἐξάρχοντες which must be read ἐξάρχοντος sc. τοῦ ῥοδοῦ.

¹ M. Müller, *De Seleuco Homérico*, D. Göttingen 1891.

² This was the opinion of H. v. Arnim, *Phil. Unters.* XI 123.

The whole section is coherent, free from alien additions, was written by Seleucus and inserted by some unknown grammarian after the time of Seleucus, e. g. Pamphilus or Phavorinus.

4) *P.* 421,2—423,9.

In the treatise of Herodicus the verse δ 74 was quoted in its original form. The learned grammarian who excerpted Herodicus for his compilation — be it Pamphilus or Phavorinus or someone else — and who was the immediate source of Athenaeus, inserted the commentary of Seleucus on this verse; it is easy to see the junction in the words *περὶ δὲ τῶν κτημάτων*. Seleucus' commentary on δ 74 contains mainly the following points:

a) Defence of his own suggestion *Ζηρός που τοιαῦτα δόμοις ἐν κτήμασι κεῖται* starting from the sense of *ἀλλή*.¹

b) Discussion of *ἀλλή*, *ἀλλών* (*ἄρσενικῶς* or *θηλυκῶς* with citations); it finishes with the juxtaposition of *δόμοι* and *κτήματα* δ 79, 190 A.

c) *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπανιτέον ἐπὶ τὸ συμπόσιον ἐν ᾧ "Ομηρος ἐπιδεξίως ἀφορμὴν εὔρεν λόγων, ὥστε κτήμασι κτήσιν συγκρῖναι φίλον*. These words have been thoroughly misinterpreted. It is Seleucus who, after his etymological digression, returns to *τὸ τοῦ Μενελάου συμπόσιον* (compare 181 C) and goes on with his commentary.

d) Menelaus declines the comparison with Zeus and in a very gentle manner displays his *φιλάδελφον ἦθος*; compare with this analysis the words of Seleucus 182 A *"Ομηρος ὥσπερ ἀγαθὸς ζωγράφος*. Helena's *φιλεργία* and *σωφροσύνη* are further analysed; she is here showing quite other sides than the usual ones: *οὐ χλιδῶσα γὰρ οὔτε θρυπτομένη διὰ τὸ κάλλος εἰσάγεται*.

The whole section is written by Seleucus and shows us clearly what a good author we have lost in this interpreter of Homer. He looks at the text in a quite unprejudiced way and takes up a critical attitude towards the Pergamenes as well as Aristarchus. Obviously he is a clever scholar with a good education and great skill. His etymological contributions are numerous and as a rule bear witness of his sound judgment. His attempts at psychological interpretation and understanding of the text are unique in antiquity. It is not only formal grammatical questions or questions of mythology, geography and antiquities that have awakened his interest — of the

¹ This is in fact a very sensible reading.

Homeric cosmography of the Pergamenes there is not a hint — but he has really tried to understand the poetical figures and their deportment in Homer and discover the psychological motives behind the dry words of the poem. In a refreshing and salutary manner he therefore shows off against the other commentators of Homer.¹

5) *P.* 429, 13—20 *Διαμαρτάνουσι δὲ — ἀπαρκεῖ.*

At first sight one is inclined to regard this as an addition by Seleucus. If we compare the treatise *Περὶ τοῦ τῶν ἡρώων καθ' Ὀμηρον βίου*, of which there are considerable remainders in the first book of Athenaeus², we find that the section on *τροφαί* p. 429, 6—13, corresponds to 11 B *ὅτι τροφαῖς ἐχρῶντο οἱ ἥρωες*, and p. 429, 20, *ἀπαλλαγέντων* corresponds to 12 A *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀναχώρησιν αἱ δμῳαὶ ἀπὸ μὲν σῖτον πολλὴν ἤρεον καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ δέπα.* The intermediate *διαμαρτάνουσι — ἀπαρκεῖ* is clearly an addition, if we start from this comparison. The question of how to judge of this section is closely connected with our apprehension of the chapters V 19—20 as a whole.

These two chapters, which I regard as an introduction to the supposed treatise of Herodicus *Περὶ συμποσίων*, is a short summary of the cynic-stoic *communis opinio* *περὶ τοῦ τῶν ἡρώων καθ' Ὀμηρον βίου*. This is evident from the numerous parallels in the testimonia. We find the same material in Plutarch, the pseudo-Plutarchean treatise *De vita et poesi Homeri*, in Dion of Prusa and sparsely in the Aristarchean corpus of scholia.³ There are reasons to believe that Herodicus wrote this abridged account as an introduction for his calumny of Plato — and this reasonable supposition is im-

¹ Müller's collection of the fragments and his discussion of them is a good piece of work but in many respects now unsatisfying. It would be a very profitable task to collect and make a new edition of the remains of the writings of this interesting grammarian. See K. Bapp, *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik des Athenaeus, II. Seleucus*, in *Commentationes Ribbeck*, Leipzig 1888, p. 258.

² See A. Brunk, *De excerptis Περὶ τοῦ τῶν ἡρώων καθ' Ὀμηρον βίου ab Athenaeo servatis*. D. Greifswald 1887.

³ On Aristarchean doctrine of ἔθος see Ph. Hofmann, *Aristarchs Studien de cultu et victu heroum im Anschluss an Lehrs*, D. München 1905, and A. Roemer, *Aristarchus*, Leipzig 1911. Aristarch gives a plain description of accessible facts, the Pergamenes idealize.

pressively corroborated by the words 192 D *δπερ*¹ *συμβάλλων τις πρὸς τὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων συμπόσια κοσμιώτερον ἂν εἶροι*. To those who regard these words as an addition by Athenaeus himself, I should like to put the question: where are the parallels? Is it possible to produce a single passage, where one is able to show with certainty that Athenaeus is so skilful, attentive and to the fore, as one is always inclined to make him? Isn't it on the contrary an indisputable fact that, at every turn, we can witness his numbness, laxity and carelessness in regard to the outward form and consistency of his compilation? Athenaeus is through and through the least original of all imitative compilers, and for this we ought to be especially grateful towards him. In this lies the greatest value of his work², and we do not regret the loss of his opinions, omissions or additions; it is a great advantage for us that he did not try to improve the authors quoted. When once in a while he remembers — it is very rare indeed, and the many repetitions and apparent contradictions in his work need not be exemplified — that he has taken up something before, his excerpting becomes very negligent, as is shown by 192 A *δσάκις—προειρηγάμεν ἤδη*.

Just in this badly mutilated section, abridged by Athenaeus, p. 429,⁶—430,², the disputed insertion *διαμαρτάνουσι — ἀπαρκεῖ* occurs. The scholia show that it contains a common Alexandrian conception. In *Od. a* 139—141 these verses are in their right place, for Mentès arrived *ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, but. *Od. δ* 55 *τὰ περὶ τῆς ταμίας* must be rejected as out-of-place, for Telemachus and Pisistratus arrived at the house of Menelaus when the banquet had already commenced (*ἐπεισεληλύθασιν*). By the way this is a rather silly remark, which does not at all fit in with the type of exegesis that we have found to be typical of Seleucus; if on the other hand, this explanation is regarded as Aristarchean, this is only true in the sense that it is included in the petrified *corpus scholiorum* which bears his name.

I cannot see any irrefutable objection to the presumption that Herodicus himself inserted this observation, which is so intimately connected with his treatment of the convivial customs. It is al-

¹ This *δπερ* is a typical feature in Herodicus' style.

² On this ground the opposite is true of the *Συμμίκτων ἱστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων λόγοι* of Pamphila, *Photius cod.* 175.

together consistent with the abridged account of *συμποσίου ἀγωγῆς παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις*, which he placed as an introduction to his comparative study of banqueting manners.

As to the disposition of the supposed treatise *Περὶ συμποσίων* it is wise to state from the beginning that it is out of the question to do anything but make a more or less well-founded attempt at rearranging the scattered parts of this treatise. Hence it would seem most advisable to publish the text just as it stands in Athenaeus. But against this may be argued that the order of the text in Athenaeus evidently is intentionally inverted. This is a typical feature in compilations of this kind, the authors of which distribute their stuff under different catchwords and in such a manner that they conceal their immediate sources, although they generously quote the original ones.

The works of Herodicus seem to have passed through several hands before they finally found their way to Athenaeus. I hazard the following hypothesis, which must however be taken for what it is worth — a presumption as to how it could have been done.

Didymus, in the time of Cicero, wrote a work with the title *Συμποσιακά*, also called *Σύμμικτα*. There is a considerable portion of this work in Athenaeus, which M. Schmidt in his collection of the fragments of Didymus has overlooked. Chapter IV 15 deals with the convivial customs of the Spartans; in chapter 16 Polemo is quoted; then he goes on p. 139 C *ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Πολέμων, πρὸς δὲ ἀντιλέγων Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς . . . φησὶ τάδε*. This quotation extends at least as far as 141 F (so Kaibel and Cohn *RE* V 470), but probably it does not end before chapter 30, p. 148 D. A long series of different convivial customs is enumerated and discussed in detail. It seems to me very probable that also the excerpts from the treatise of Herodicus were originally made by Didymus, especially as *schol. Ran.* 1028 proves that Didymus knew some work by Herodicus.¹

Afterwards Didymus' work was used by a later grammarian, e. g. Pamphilus², who inserted the observations of Seleucus. Didymus

¹ See below p. 126 and M. Schmidt *Didymi fragmenta*, 250, 17 and Steinhausen *Κωμωδοῦμενοι* p. 48 n. 2.

² J. Schönemann, *De lexicographis antiquis*, Hannover 1886.

and Pamphilus have probably already disturbed the order of the original work, and Athenaeus, to be sure, makes it worse. In the case of the essay *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην* it is obvious that he deliberately distributed the fragments in different books.

Thus the only thing we can do is to look at the contents of the fragments and try to find an acceptable disposition, thereby taking the risk of altering or even improving the original author.

I. *Περὶ συμποσίου συναγωγῆς παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* 192 B—193 C.

This is an abridged account of old post-Zenodotean theories on the life and customs of the Homeric heroes. The contents of this treatise, as far as Homeric customs are regarded, is common property of many authors. The parallel passages from the scholia and other sources which I have added to the edition of the text, show the dissemination of these remarks. I have urged that this treatise is mainly a work by Herodicus, who himself collected the material. This view is strengthened by a comparison of the different versions of this particular chapter.

192 B.

Πᾶσα δὲ συμποσίου συναγωγή παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τὴν αἰτίαν εἰς θεὸν ἀνέφερε, καὶ στεφάνοις ἐχρῶντο τοῖς οἰκείοις τῶν θεῶν καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς καὶ δοῦλος οὐδείς ἦν ὁ διακονήσων, ἀλλ' οἱ νέοι τῶν ἐλευθέρων ὠνοχόουν, ὡς ὁ τοῦ Μενελάου υἱὸς καίτοι νυμφίος ὑπάρχων καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς γάμοις. παρὰ δὲ τῇ καλῇ Σαπφοῦ καὶ ὁ Ἑρμῆς οἰνοχοεῖ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τᾶλλα δὲ πάντα παρεσκεύαζον τοῖς δειπνοῦσιν ἐλεύθεροι.

40 C *Σέλευκος δὲ φησι τὸ παλαιὸν οὐκ εἶναι ἔθος οὗτ' οἶνον ἐπὶ πλεῖον οὗτ' ἄλλην ἡδυπάθειαν προσφέρεισθαι μὴ θεῶν ἔνεκα τοῦτο δρῶντας.*

18 B *καὶ Μενελάου δὲ τελούντος γάμονος ὁ νυμφίος Μεγαπένθηος οἰνοχοεῖ.*
The same error as in 192 B.

T-schol. A 470 and o 141 *ἀρχαῖον ἔθος οἰνοχοεῖν τοὺς νέους· οἰνοχοεῖ δὲ υἱὸς Μενελάου.*

424 E *ὠνοχόουν τε παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις οἱ εὐγενέστατοι παῖδες ὡς ὁ τοῦ Μενελάου υἱός· (o 141) ὠνοχόει δ' υἱὸς Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο.* Thus not at his own wedding.

T-schol. Y 234 *ἔθος γὰρ ἦν, ὡς καὶ Σαπφῶ φησιν, νέους εὐγενεῖς εὐπρεπέσιν οἰνοχοεῖν.*

425 C *Ἀλκαῖος δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν εἰσάγει αὐτῶν οἰνοχόον, ὡς καὶ Σαπφῶ λέγουσα (follows fr. 135 Diehl).*

One thing seems to me to be an obvious consequence of this comparison: Seleucus has written out some more detailed source. Hero-dicus version is rich in details and well composed; his version seems to be a compilation of his own.

II. *Tà nŷn δεῖπνα* 185 C—186 D.

III. *Ἡμεῖς δὲ νŷn περὶ τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν συμποσίων λέξομεν, χρόνοι πρόσωπα, αἰτίας.* Homer, Xenophon, Plato and Epicurus. To this section 185 BC seems to belong. It deals with *αἰτίαι*, *χρόνοι* and *πρόσωπα* but seems to be badly contracted and mutilated.

IV. 185 C *Δοκεῖ* — *ἕκαστον ἡμῶν* is all tattered and torn. It originally contained a discussion of the question, why it was customary at the Homeric banquets to invite the guests to eat and drink before the question was put to them, from where they came, who they were, and what their errand was — the well-known *χαῖρε, ξεῖνε, παρ' ἄμμι φιλήσεται, ἀντὰρ ἔπειτα δείπνον πασσάμενος μνηθήσεται, ὅττιό σε χρεῖ, Od. a 123. Δοκεῖ γὰρ ἔχειν* indicates that something has been left out. Hospitality in itself was highly esteemed and every guest or stranger was just as friendly and liberally received. *Οὐ τοὺς ἐν μέρει καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἡμῶν* means that one did not care to inquire who the individual stranger was, and did not enter into particulars before he had been hospitably received. In the scholia to the passage there are fragments of a similar discussion, which show that just these words *Δοκεῖ γὰρ κτλ.* once contained an abridged account of old Alexandrian exegesis.

V. *Τίνας κλητέον* 186 F—187 A.

VI. On the guests. 187 AB, 177 AB, 192 AB.

- a) 187 AB, 177 A. In Homer men of different age and character (*προαίρεσις*), but always prominent, are invited. Epicurus invited only *προφήτας ἀτόμων*, Plato *ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλης προαιρέσεως σπουδάζοντας* and Xenophon *καὶ τινὰς ιδιώτας*.
- b) 177 B, 192 AB. In Homer the banquets are varied, and we find *τῶν μνηστήρων συμπόσιον Od. a 144—229, τὸ δὲ τῶν Φαίάκων Od. θ 234, ι 5, ἐπὶ στρατιᾷ Il. H 313 (βουλευτήριον), I 173 (συνέδριον), B 398 (δημοθωϊάν)*, further *τὰ δὲ πολιτικώτερον τελούμενα, Od. δ ι (οἰκείων σύνοδον)*. Epicurus has arranged a banquet of philosophers only, and Plato's banquet is neither one nor the other, neither *συνέδριον*, nor *βουλευτήριον*, nor *λέσχη φιλοσόφων*.

VII. *Οὗς οὐ δεῖ καλεῖν*, 177 C, 178 A—E.

Plato has misinterpreted the *αὐτόματοι* of Homer.

VIII. On personal hygiene, 178 EF.

IX. 178 F *Δεῖ δὲ καὶ* — 179 B *αὐλῆς θαύμασον*.

The importance of house-inspection and good breeding in general.

Compare *schol.* A on Z 176.

X. 179 BD *σπονδαί, ἀπαρχαί*.

XI. 179 E—180 B on the use of wine.

XII. 182 AB, 187 A on parasites, *κόλακες*.

XIII. 187 C—F, 188 A—F. On topics of conversation, *ζητήματα*, in Epicurus, Plato, Xenophon, and Homer. This comparison between the *ζητήματα* proposed at the banquet of Menelaus in the fourth rhapsody and the *ζητήματα* proposed in Plato's *Banquet* seems just a little bit halting. Is it a joke or is it serious? To be sure, it is a quite incredible story, but probably Herodicus knew that the public of his age would swallow it. If it was seriously meant — and this can hardly be doubted — we must conclude that the average educated man of this age knew practically nothing of Plato, except the famous name.

XIV. 191 DE. When is it time to break up from a banquet?

Some words on Egyptian customs are added, which may be an addition by Didymus.

We do not know anything about the title of this treatise of Herodicus. I suppose it was a part of his work *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα*, and probably never was a separate book with a particular title. As a heading I have put the words *περὶ συμποσίων*, used by Athenaeus himself in the introduction of the fifth book. Taking the parallels between this treatise and the essay *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην* in consideration, we must however assume that they were published as different works on different occasions.

ΠΕΡΙ ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΩΝ

V 19, 192 B I. Πᾶσα δὲ συμποσίον συναγωγὴ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τὴν αἰτίαν εἰς
θεὸν ἀνέφερε, καὶ στεφάνοις ἐχρῶντο τοῖς οἰκείοις τῶν θεῶν καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ
ᾠδαῖς. καὶ δοῦλος οὐδείς ἦν ὁ διακονήσων, ἀλλ' οἱ νέοι τῶν ἐλευθέρων ὦνο- 3
χόουν, ὡς ὁ τοῦ Μενελάου υἱὸς καίτοι νυμφίος ὑπάρχων καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς
γάμοις. παρὰ δὲ τῇ καλῇ Σαπφοῖ καὶ ὁ Ἑρμῆς οἶνοχοεῖ τοῖς θεοῖς. καὶ τᾷλ-
C λα δὲ πάντα παρεσκεύαζον τοῖς δειπνοῦσιν ἐλεύθεροι. καὶ οἱ δειπνήσαντες 6
ἀπελύοντο φωτὸς ὄντος. ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ τῶν Περσικῶν συμποσίων ἐγί-
νοντό τινες καὶ βουλαί, καθάπερ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος κατὰ τὴν στρα-
τείαν. τὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλκινόου συμπόσιον, πρὸς ὃ ἀποτέταται <ὁ> τοῦ Ὀδυσ- 9
σέως λόγος·

οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγέ τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι
D ἢ ὅταν εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχῃ κατὰ δῆμον ἅπαντα, 12
δαιτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' ἀκουάζωνται ἀοιδοῦ,

1 Cfr R. Weber, *De Dioscuridis Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ νόμων*, Leipz. Stud. XI (1889), p. 87 sqq. εἰς θεόν] *Ath.* 40 c 2 στεφάνοις] *at Ath.* I 9 E ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ στεφανομένους κτλ. 3 ὦνοχόουν] *Ath.* 18 B καὶ Μενελάου δὲ τελούν-
τος γάμους ὁ νυμφίος Μεγαπένθης οἶνοχοεῖ 5 Σαπφοῖ] *fr.* 135 Diehl κῆ δ' ἄμβροσιās μὲν κράτηρ ἐκέκρατ' Ἑρμῆς δ' ἔλων ὄλπιν θέοισ' οἶνοχόησε, cfr *Ath.* 425 C et 39 A 7 φωτὸς ὄντος cfr 191 E et *Plut. Instit. Lacōn.* 3 ἀπίασι δίχα λαμπάδος· οὐ γὰρ ἔξεστιν πρὸς φῶς βαδίζειν *Περσικῶν] Ath.* 144 AB ex *Herod.* I 133 μεθυσκόμενοι δὲ εἰώθασι βουλευέσθαι τὰ σπουδαῖα τῶν πρηγμάτων 8 ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος] *Il.* 7, 313 cfr ἐπὶ στρατιᾷς 177 B 11 *Od.* 9, 5—7 cfr *Schol.* ἀπρεπὲς τέλος ὀρίζειν τροφὴν καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν, *Ath.* 512 D καὶ Ὀμηρος δὲ τὴν εὐφροσύνην καὶ τὸ εὐφραίνεσθαι τέλος φησὶν εἶναι χαριέστερον, ὅταν δαιτυμόνες μὲν ἀοιδοῦ ἀκουάζωνται, παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι, 16 D ἀ ἐπη Ἑρατοσθένης οὕτω γεγραφθαι φησὶν· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε τί φημι τέλος χαριέστερον εἶναι ἢ ὅταν εὐφροσύνη μὲν ἔχῃ κακότητος ἀπούσης· κακότητος ἀπούσης φάσκων τῆς ἀφροσύνης· ἀδύνατον γὰρ μὴ φρονίμους εἶναι Φαίακας, οἱ μάλ' αὖ φίλοι εἰσι θεοῖσιν, ὡς ἡ *Ναυσικάα* φησὶ (6, 203)

1 εἰς θεοῦς epitomator

9 <ὁ> Musurus

ξένον ὑποδοχὴν ἔχει, ὄντων καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν Φαιάκων τρυφερῶν, ὅπερ συμ- 192 D
βάλλων τις πρὸς τὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων συμπόσια κοσμιώτερον ἂν εὔροι, καίτοι
3 <καὶ> τοῦτο περιέχον καὶ ἰλαρότητα καὶ παιδιὰν εὐσχήμονα. μετὰ γὰρ
τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν γυμνικὸν ἄδει ὁ ᾧδὸς ἄμφ' Ἄρεος φιλότητα' μῦθόν τινα
χλεύη κεκραμένον, καίτοι εἰς τὴν μνηστηροφονίαν ὑποθηκῶν ὑποτιθεμένων
6 τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ, ὡς [τοῦ Ἡφαίστου] καὶ τοῦ Κυλλοποδιῶνος τὸν ἀνδρειότατον E
Ἄρη καταγωνισαμένον.

Ἐκαθέζοντο δὲ καὶ δειπνοῦντες οἱ τότε. πολλαχοῦ γοῦν ὁ Ὅμηρος φησιν· V 20

9 ἐξείης ἔζοντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε.

ὁ γὰρ θρόνος αὐτὸ μόνον ἐλευθέριός ἐστιν καθέδρα σὺν ὑποποδίῳ, ὅπερ
θρῆνυν καλοῦντες ἐντεῦθεν αὐτὸν ὠνόμασαν θρόνον τοῦ θρησασθαι χάριν,
12 ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ καθέζεσθαι τάσσουσιν, ὡς Φιλίτας·

θρησασθαι [δὲ] πλατάνῳ γαίῃ ὕπο.

ὁ δὲ κλισμὸς περιττοτέρως κεκόσμηται ἀνακλίσει. τούτων δ' εὐτελέστερος F

I Suidas s. v. Ὅμηρος· καὶ Ἀλκίῳ δὲ τρυφερὸν ἡρημένῳ βίον, σπουδάζων ἡμᾶς
ἀποστήσαι τῶν ἀτάκτων ἐπιθυμιῶν . . . τοὺς τρυφερωτάτους ἐστιῶν Φαίλακας καὶ τὸν
Ὀδυσσεῖα ξενίζων, *Ath.* 16 D ἀπολαυστικὸς δὲ ἐστι παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ τῶν Φαιάκων
βίος, 513 A ὁ δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ὀμήρῳ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἡγεμὼν δοκεῖ γεγενῆσθαι Ἐπικούρῳ
τῆς πολυθρῆλῆτος ἡδονῆς (referuntur v. 15—11), 513 E διόπερ καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς τρυφῇ
καὶ λαγνείᾳ τέλος τοῦ βίου παρὰ τῷ Ἀλκινόῳ τίθεται 4 ᾄδει] *Od.* 8, 267, cfr
Ath. 14 A et 14 D, [Plut.] *de vita et poesi Homeri* c. 214 6 Κυλλοποδιῶνος]
Il. 18, 371 etc. 8 ἐκαθέζοντο] *Ath.* 11 F εὐωχοῦνται δὲ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ καθήμενοι

9 *Od.* 1, 145, 3, 389 10 θρόνος] *Eustath.* in *Od.* 4, 51 p. 1482, 3:
θρόνος δὲ ὅτι ἐλευθέριός ἐστι καθέδρα σὺν ὑποποδίῳ. καὶ ὅτι θρῆνυν τὸ ὑποπόδιον
καλοῦντες, ἐντεῦθεν καὶ τὸν θρόνον ὠνόμασαν τοῦ θρησασθαι χάριν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ
καθέζεσθαι λέγουσιν, ὁ Ἀθήναιος λέγει, παρ' ᾧ καὶ χρῆσις Φιλίτα, τὸ ἰθὺς θρησασθαι
δὲ πλατάνῳ γαίῃ ὕπο. ὁ δὲ γε κλισμὸς φησι περισσοτέρως κεκόσμηται ἐπὶ ἀνακλίσει.
διορισμὸς δὲ τούτων ἐν τῷ ἑκατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε. τούτων δ' εὐτελέστερον
ὁ δίφρος· τῷ γοῦν Ὀδυσσεῖ ἐπαίτη δοκοῦντι δίφρος ἀεικέλιος παρατίθεται ὀλίγη τε
τράπεζα. ἴσως δὲ ἐκεῖ τὸ ἀεικέλιος διαστολήν τινα δηλοῖ, ὡς ὄντος δίφρου καὶ μὴ
ἀεικέλιου, cfr εὐξεστον, περικαλλέα v 387 et *Eustath.* in *Il.* 24, 597 ὅρα ταυτότητα
ὡς ἐν πολυωνυμίᾳ, θρόνον δίφρου καὶ κλισμοῦ 12 Φιλίτας fr. 22 Diehl, Wil.
Hellenist. Dicht. I 114 cum adn. 4.

I τρυφῶν epitomator 3 <καὶ> Kaibel 4 φιλότητος C
5 ὑποθήκας ὑποτιθέμενον maluit Casaubonus τοῦ Ἡφαίστου καὶ om. epi-
tomator, glossam del. Kaibel 11 αὐτὸς μόνος epitomator 12 Φιλίτας
epitomator 13 [δὲ] Musurus γαίῃ] λασίη Heinrich ex A. P. XVI, 227, 6

192 F ἦν ὁ δῖφρος· τῷ γοῦν Ὀδυσσεὶ ἐπαίτη εἶναι δοκοῦντι δῖφρον ἀεικέλιον, φησί, καταθείς ὀλίγην τε τράπεζαν·

Οἱ δὲ κρατῆρες αὐτοῖς, ὥσπερ ἔχει καὶ τοῦνομα, κεκραμένοι παρεστήκε- 3
σαν, ἐξ ὧν οἱ κοῦροι διακονοῦμενοι τοῖς μὲν ἐντιμοτάτοις αἰεὶ πλήρες παρεί-
χον τὸ ποτήριον, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἐξ ἴσου διένεμον. ὁ γοῦν Ἀγαμέμνων πρὸς
τὸν Ἰδομενέα φησί· 6

193 σὸν δὲ πλεῖον δέπας αἰεὶ
ἔστηχ', ὥσπερ ἐμοί, πικεῖν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγει.

προέπινον δ' ἀλλήλοισι οὐχ ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς — τοῦτο γὰρ προεκπιεῖν ἐστίν — 9
ἀλλὰ μεστὸν τὸν σκύφον·

πλησάμενος δ' οἴνοιο δέπας δείδεκτ' Ἀχιλλῆα.

Ῥοσάκις δὲ καὶ τροφὰς ἐλάμβανον, προειρηκάμεν ἤδη, ὅτι δὴ τρεῖς ἦσαν 12
διὰ τὸ τὸ αὐτὸ ποτε μὲν ἄριστον, ποτὲ δὲ δεῖπνον ὀνομάζεσθαι. γελοῖοι
γάρ εἰσιν οἱ φάσκοντες ὅτι καὶ τέσσαρας ἐλάμβανον, ἐπεὶ ὁ ποιητὴς ἔφη
ῥὸν δ' ἔρχεο διειλιγσας, σὺ νοοῦντες ὅτι λέγει τὸν δειλινὸν διατράψας χρό- 15
B νον. ὁμως δὲ σὺδεῖς δεῖξει παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ τρεῖς τινα λαμβάνοντα τροφὰς.

3 κρατῆρες] *Ath.* 13 D ἐκάστῳ δὲ τῶν δαιτυμόνων παρ' Ὀμήρῳ παράκειται ποτή-
ριον, cfr *Plut. quaest. conv.* II 10 p. 643 B 5 Ἀγαμέμνων] *Il.* 4, 262
9 προέπινον] *Ath.* 13 F ἦν δὲ τις αὐτοῖς καὶ διὰ τῆς προπόσεως ἀσπασμός. οἱ γοῦν
θεοὶ ῥχρυσέοις δεπάεσσι δειδέχατ' ἀλλήλους (Δ 1), ἤτοι ἐδεξιοῦντο προπίνοντες ἑαυτοῖς
ταῖς δεξαῖς. καὶ τις δὲ δείδεκτ' Ἀχιλλῆα (I 224) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐδεξιοῦντο, ὃ ἐστὶ προέπινεν
αὐτῷ τῇ δεξιᾷ διδόνς τὸ ποτήριον, cfr *schol.* I 224 προεκπιεῖν] *Ath.* 498 C ἐξέπινον
ἀντὶ τοῦ προέπινον. κυρίως γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦτο προπίνειν, τὸ ἐτέρῳ πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ δοῦναι
πιεῖν. καὶ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ὀμήρῳ τῇ (ν 57) Ἀρήτῃ δ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει δέπας
ἀμφικύπελλον, καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι (I 224) πλησάμενος δ' οἴνοιο δέπας δείδεκτ' Ἀχιλλῆα.
πληροῦντες γὰρ προέπινον ἀλλήλοισι μετὰ προαγορεύσεως. 12 προειρηκάμεν]
Ath. 11 B ὅτι τροφαῖς ἐχρῶντο <οἱ> ἥρωες παρ' Ὀμήρῳ πρῶτον μὲν τῷ καλονμένῳ
ἀκρατίσματι, ὃ λέγει ἄριστον. 14 οἱ φάσκοντες] 11 D Φιλήμων δὲ φησὶν ὅτι
τροφαῖς τέσσαρσιν ἐχρῶντο οἱ παλαιοί, ἀκρατίσματι, ἀρίστον, ἐσπερίσματι, δεῖπνον
(referuntur Aeschyl. *Palamed. fr.* 176 Nauck,) cfr *Plut. quaest. conv.* VIII 6, 4

τέσσαρας] 11 E τῆς δὲ τετάρτης τροφῆς οὕτως Ὀμηρος μέμνηται (q 599). ῥὸν δ'
ἔρχεο διειλιγσας, ὃ καλοῦσιν τινες δειλινόν, ὃ ἐστὶ μεταξὺ τοῦ ὕψ' ἡμῶν λεγομένου
ἀρίστον καὶ δεῖπνον. καὶ ἄριστον μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν ἑω λαμβανόμενον, δεῖπνον δὲ
τὸ μεσημβρινόν, ὃ ἡμεῖς ἄριστον, δόρπον δὲ τὸ ἐσπερινόν. μήποτε δὲ καὶ συνωνυμεῖ
τὸ ἄριστον τῷ δεῖπνῳ (sequuntur exempla)

3 παρειστήκεισαν epitomator

8 ἀνώγη Hom.

11 Ἀχιλλῆα A

15 διειλιγσας A

Διαμαρτάνουσι δὲ πολλοὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐφεξῆς τιθέντες τούτους τοὺς 193 B
στίχους·

3 σῖτον δ' αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
εἶδατα πόλλ' ἐπιθεῖσα, χαριζομένη παρεόντων
δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνakas παρέθηκεν ἀείρας.

6 εἰ γὰρ εἶδατα παρέθηκεν ἡ ταμίη, δηλὸν ὥς κρεάτων λείψανα τυγχάνοντα,
τὸν δαιτρὸν οὐκ ἔδει παρεισφέρειν. διόπερ τὸ δίστιχον ἀπαρχει.

Ἀπαλλαγέντων δὲ τῶν δειπνούντων αἱ τράπεζαι ἐβαστάζοντο, ὥσπερ
9 παρὰ τοῖς μνηστῆρσι καὶ τοῖς Φαίαισι, ἐφ' ὧν καὶ λέγει·

ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἀπεκόσμεον ἔντα δαιτός,

C

δηλὸν ὥς τὰ ἀγγεῖα. καὶ γὰρ τῶν ὄπλων τὰ σκεπαστικά, θώρακα καὶ
12 κνημίδας καὶ τὰ τούτοις ἐμφορῇ λέγουσιν ἔντη, καθάπερ ἀγγεῖα τῶν τοῦ
σώματος μερῶν ὄντα. τῶν δὲ ἡρωικῶν οἴκων τοὺς μελίζοντας Ὁμηρος μέ-
γαρα καλεῖ καὶ δώματα καὶ κλισίας, οἱ δὲ νῦν ξενῶνας καὶ ἀνδρῶνας ὀνο-
15 μάζουσι.

3 *Od.* I 139—141. *Suidas* s. v. "Ὁμηρος (cfr *Ath.* 8 F) ἀπλὴν οὖν ἀποδέδωκε τὴν
δίαιταν πᾶσι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὁμοίως βασιλεῦσιν ἰδιώταις, νέοις πρεσβύταις, λέγων
(η 174) 'παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν· σῖτον δ' αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
(α 141) δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνakas παρέθηκεν ἀείρας'. *Schol. in η 174*: ἀθετεῖται τὸ
ἔπος ὥς ἀσύμφωνον τῇ τοῦ Ὁμήρου συνηθείᾳ· οὐ γὰρ ποιεῖ τὰς τραπέζας ἀφαιρουμένας
παρόντων τῶν δαιτυμόνων, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν. *Damnavit* v. 139—140
Aristarchus, cfr *schol.* δ 54: εἰκότως δὲ νῦν τὰ περὶ τῆς ταμίας παρακείνται· οὐ γὰρ ἐν
τῷ ξενίζεσθαι παρὰ Τηλεμάχῳ τὴν Ἀθηναῖαν ἐπεισεληλύθασιν γὰρ οὗτοι τοῖς περὶ τὸν
Μενέλαον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς δὲ παρὰ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ πάρεστιν ὁ Μέντης. *Eustath.* ad locum,
1401,21: σημειῶσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὸ 'δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνakas παρέθηκεν ἀείρας'
διαγράφεσθαι ἱστορεῖ Ἀθήναιος, ἐπειδὴ ἀπαρκεῖν δοκεῖ τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ δίστιχον. εἰ γὰρ
φῃσιν εἶδατα παρέθηκεν ἡ ταμίη κρεάτων ὄντα λείψανα, τὸν δαιτρὸν οὐκ ἔδει παρει-
σφέρειν. καὶ μὴν καινὸν ἄλλως οὐδὲν τῶν τριῶν στίχων φυλαττομένων, τὴν μὲν ταμίην
ἔωλα παραθέσθαι, τὸν δ' αὖ δαιτρὸν ἑτεροῖα παντοῖα πρόσφατα ποικιλίας τε χάριν
καὶ πρὸς φιλοφροσύνης ἐνδειξίν.

10 *Od.* 7,232, cfr *Ath.* II F—12 A.

11 ἀγγεῖα] *Eustath.* in *Od.* 7,232 ἔντα δαιτός, ἥτοι ὄπλα, ὅλον τραπέζας, κρητῆρας,
κάνεα καὶ ὅσοις δὲ ἄλλοις ἐξαρτύεται τράπεζα, cfr *eundem in II.* 9,203 p. 747,2
σκευή, cfr *Apollon. Lex. Homer.* Bekker, p. 69,17 13 ἡρωικῶν οἴκων]
Ath. 16 C, cfr *Dion. Chrys. Or. II de regno* 37, eadem affert *Eustath.* in *Od.* 4,72
p. 1483,23 14 ἀνδρῶνας] *Vitruv.* VI 7,5 p. 139,27 *Krohn*, *Xen. Conv.* I
13 ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνδρῶνι ἔνθα τὸ δεῖπνον ἦν

6 λειψάνων A 11 ἀγγεῖα *Dindorf*: αἷτια A om. epitomator
14 ὀνομάζουσι *Casaubonus*: νομίζουσι A om. epitomator.

185 C II. Τῶν δὲ νῦν δείπνων προνοοῦντες οἱ νομοθέται τά τε φυλειακά δείπνα
καὶ τὰ δημοτικά προσέταξαν, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς θιάσους καὶ τὰ φρατριακά καὶ
186 A πάλιν <τὰ> ὀργεωνικά λεγόμενα. πολλῶν γοῦν εἰσι φιλοσόφων ἐν ἄστει 3
σύνοδοι τῶν μὲν Διογενιστῶν, τῶν δὲ Ἀντιπατριστῶν λεγομένων, τῶν δὲ
Παναιτιαστῶν. κατέλιπε δὲ καὶ Θεόφραστος εἰς τὴν τοιαύτην σύνοδον
χρήματα, μὰ Δί' οὐχ ἵνα ἀκολασταίνωσι συνιόντες, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὰ κατὰ τὸν 6
τοῦ συμποσίου νόμον σωφρόνως καὶ πεπαιδευμένως διεξάγωσι. συνεδεί-
πνουν δ' ὁσημέραι οἱ περὶ πρῶτανιν σώφρονα καὶ σωτήρια τῶν πόλεων σύν-
B δειπνα. πρὸς γοῦν τοιοῦτο συμπόσιον φησιν ὁ Δ η μ ο σ θ ἔ ν η ς ἀνηγέχθαι 9
τὴν Ἐλατείας κατάληπιν· ἑσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν, ἥκε δὲ ἀγγέλλων τις ὡς
τοὺς πρυτάνεις ὡς Ἐλάτεια κατείληπται.'

Καὶ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις δὲ ἐπιμελὲς ἦν συνάγουσι τοὺς νέους μετ' αὐτῶν πρὸς 12
τινα τεταγμένον νόμον εὐωχεῖσθαι. τοῦ γοῦν Ξενοκράτους ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ
καὶ πάλιν Ἀριστοτέλους συμποτικοὶ τινες ἦσαν νόμοι. τὰ δὲ ἐν Σπάρτῃ
φιδίτια καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Κρησὶν ἀνδρεία μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας αἱ πόλεις 15
συνήγον. διὸ καὶ τ ι ς οὐ κακῶς ἔφη·

C οὐ χρὴ συμποσίῳ φίλους ἀπέχεσθαι ἑταίρους
δῆρον· ἀνάμνησις δὲ πέλει χαριστάτη αὐτῇ.

18

5 Θεόφραστος] Diog. Laert. V 52 τὸν δὲ κῆπον καὶ τὸν περίπατον καὶ τὰς οἰκίας
τὰς πρὸς τῷ κήπῳ πάσας δίδωμι τῶν γεγραμμένων φίλων ἀεὶ τοῖς βουλομένοις
συσχολάζειν καὶ συμφιλοσοφεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς 7 συνεδείπνουν] in cultu Hestiae
mos originatur et per saecula duravit, cfr Liv. XLII 20,7 Cyzici in Prytaneum —
id est penetrale urbis ubi publice, quibus is honos datus est, vescuntur — vasa aurea
mensae unius posuit. Aequalis eius Parthenius in libro q. i. Ἐρωτικά παθήματα
haec: καὶ ἐπειδὴ αὐτὴν ἐξήτει ὁ Ὑψικρέων, ἱκέτης προσκαθίετο τῆς Ἑστίας τῆς ἐν
πρυτανείῳ. Athenaeus (c. 200 A. D.) 149 D παρὰ Ναυκρατίταις ἐν πρυτανείῳ δει-
πνοῦσι γενεθλίους Ἑστίας πρυτανίτιδος. Veterem morem tempore igitur valde
mutatum esse testatur etiam Dionys. Hal. II 23, qui de eo imperfecto qu. d.
tempore loquitur. 9 Demosth. περὶ στεφάνου 169 14 συμποτικοὶ νόμοι]
Diog. Laert. V 26 νόμος συστατικός vel συσσιτικός cfr Heitz, Die verlor. Schriften
des Aristoteles, 1865, p. 238, Athen. 3 F. 15 ἀνδρεία] Dosiadas ap. Ath.
143 B, FHG IV 399: οἱ δὲ Λύττιοι συνάγουσι μὲν τὰ κοινὰ συσσίτια οὕτως.
ἕκαστος τῶν γινόμενων καρπῶν ἀναφέρει τὴν δεκάτην εἰς τὴν ἑταιρίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς
πόλεως προσόδους, ἃς διανέμουν οἱ προσεσθηκότες τῆς πόλεως εἰς τοὺς ἑκάστων
οἴκους. τῶν δὲ δούλων ἕκαστος Αἰγναῖον φέρει στατήρα κατὰ κεφαλὴν. διήρηνται
δ' οἱ πολῖται πάντες καθ' ἑταιρίας, καλοῦσι δὲ ταύτας ἀ ν δ ρ ε ῖ α. 17 Adesp.,
Poet. lyr. Bergk II 73.

1 δείπνα del. Kaibel 3 <τά> Kaibel 4 Διογενειαστῶν malebat
Wilamowitz 7 νόμον Wilamowitz: λόγον A ἵνα τοὺς κατὰ τὸ συμπόσιον
λόγους σωφρόνως epitomator. 15 καὶ τὰ epitomator: καὶ A 17 συμπο-
σίοισι A: corr. Casaubonus

Ἀντίπατρος δ' ὁ φιλόσοφος συμπόσιον ποτε συνάγων συνέταξε τοῖς ἐρχο- 186 C
 μένοις ὡς περὶ σοφισμάτων ἐροῦσιν. Ἀρκεσίλαον δὲ φασιν εἰς συμπόσιον
 3 παρακληθέντα καὶ συγκατακληθέντα ἐνὶ τῶν βορῶς ἐσθιόντων, αὐτὸν δὲ
 μηδενὸς ἀπολαῦσαι δυνάμενον, ἐπεὶ τις αὐτῷ τῶν παρόντων ἐξέτεινεν,
 φάναι·

6 εἴ σοι γένοιτο, Τηλέφῳ δ' ἀγὼ νοῶ·

ἔτυχε δ' ὁ κατοψοφαγῶν Τηλέφος καλούμενος. ὁ δὲ Ζήνων ἐπεὶ τις τῶν
 παρόντων ὀψοφάγων ἀπέσυρεν ἅμα τῷ παρατεθῆναι τὸ ἐπάνω τοῦ ἰχθύος, D
 9 στρέψας καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν ἰχθὺν ἀπέσυρεν ἐπιλέγων·

Ἰνὼ δὲ τὰπὶ θάτερον ἐξειργάζετο.

Σωκράτης δ' ἰδὼν τινα ἀμέτρως τῇ ἐποψῇ χειρώμενον ὃ παρόντες, ἔφη,
 12 τίς ὑμῶν τῷ μὲν ἄρτω ὡς ὄψῳ χρῆται, τῷ δ' ὄψῳ ὡς ἄρτῳ;

III. Ἡμεῖς δὲ νῦν περὶ τῶν Ὀμηρικῶν συμποσίων λέξομεν. ἀφορίζ- V 3
 ζει γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁ ποιητὴς χρόνους, πρόσωπα, αἰτίας. τοῦτο δὲ ὁρθῶς ἀπε-
 15 μάξατο ὁ Ξενοφῶν καὶ Πλάτων, οἱ κατ' ἀρχὰς τῶν συγγραμμάτων ἐκτί- E
 θενται τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ συμποσίου καὶ τίνες οἱ παρόντες. Ἐπίκουρος δὲ οὐ
 τόπον, οὐ χρόνον ἀφορίζει, οὐ προλέγει οὐδέν. δεῖ οὖν μαντεύσασθαι πῶς
 18 ποτ' ἄνθρωπος ἐξαπίνης ἔχων κύλικα προβάλλει ζητήματα καθάπερ ἐν
 διατριβῇ λέγων.

Φησὶ δ' οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς περὶ τοῦ Μενελάου τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος·

185 B

1 Ἀντίπατρος] aliter Plut. *de garrul.* 514 D 2 Ἀρκεσίλαον] cfr Diog. Laert.
 IV 35 3 αὐτὸν δὲ] atqui ἐτελεύτησε δέ, ὡς φησιν Ἑρμιππος, ἄκρατον ἐμφορη-
 θείς πολλὴν καὶ παρακόψας Diog. Laert. IV 44 5 Eur. *fr.* 702 N., cfr *Acharn.*
 446 7 Ζήνων] cfr Diog. Laert. VII 19 = *Athen.* 345 D, de Bione *Ath.*
 344 A ex Hegesandro: *Βίων δὲ προαρπάσαντός τινος τὰ ἐπάνω τοῦ ἰχθύος στρέψας*
καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ δαφιλῶς φαγὼν ἐπεῖπεν· Ἰνὼ — ἐξειργάζετο 10 Eurip. *Bacch.*
 1129 16 Epicuri *Convivium*, Usener *Epicurea* p. 116 17 προλέγει] *Plato et Xenophon convivium sua prooemiis instruxerunt, ut Aristoteles in iis*
quos ἐξωτερικούς vocat, Cic. ep. ad Att. XV 4, 16,2

2 φασιν scripsi: φησιν codd. 4 αὐτῷ A: αὐτὸν epitomator 19 post
 λέγων haec addita in A: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἄλουτον καὶ κονιορτοῦ ἦκειν πλήρη τινὰ
 ἐπὶ τὸ συμπόσιον φησιν, cfr 176 F

185 B τὸν δ' εὖρον δαινύντα γάμον πολλοῖσιν ἔτῃσιν
υἷος ἡδὲ θυγατρὸς ἀμύμονος ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,

ὥς νενόμισται ἄγειν συμπόσια περὶ τοὺς γάμους τῶν τε γαμηλίων θεῶν 3
ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς οἰονεῖ μαρτυρίας. τὸ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ξένους συμπόσιον ὁ τῆς
Λυκίας βασιλεὺς διδάσκει οἷον εἶναι δεῖ, τὸν Βελλεροφόντην μεγαλοπρεπῶς
C δεξάμενος· 6

ἐννῆμαρ ξείνισσε καὶ ἐννέα βοῦς ἰέρευσσε.

V 2 IV. Δοκεῖ γὰρ ἔχειν πρὸς φιλίαν τι ὁ οἶνος ἐλκυστικόν, παραθερμαίνων
τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ διαχέων. διόπερ οὐδὲ πρότερον ἡρώτων οἷτινες εἶεν ἄλλ' 9
ὑστερον, ὥς τὴν ξενίαν αὐτὴν τιμῶντες, ἀλλ' οὐ τοὺς ἐν μέρει καὶ καθ'
ἕκαστον ἡμῶν.

186 F V. "Ἐπειθ' ὁ μὲν "Ομηρος ἐκδιδάσκει τίνας κλητέον, εἰπὼν ὥς τοὺς 12
ἀρίστους τε καὶ ἐντίμους χρὴ καλεῖν·

κίκλησεν δὲ γέροντας ἀριστῆας Παναχαιῶν.

οὐχ ὃν τρόπον Ἡ σί ο δ ο ς· οὗτος γὰρ ἀξιοῖ καὶ τοὺς γείτονας· 15

μάλιστα καλεῖν ὅστις σέθεν ἐγγύθι ναίει.

τοῦτο γὰρ ὥς ἀληθῶς Βοιωτικῆς ἐστὶν ἀναισθησίας συμπόσιον καὶ τῇ 18
μισανθρωποτάτῃ τῶν παροιμιῶν ἀρμόττον·

187 A τηλοῦ φίλοι ναίοντες οὐκ εἰσιν φίλοι.

1 Od. 4,3 7 Il. 6,174 8 ὁ οἶνος — παραθερμαίνων] cfr *Epicuri Conv.*
fr. 58—60 Usener e Plut. *adv. Coloten* 1109—1110 9 *schol. Z* 176 *δτι* ἔθος
ἦν παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ξενίζειν πρότερον, εἰτα πυνθάνεσθαι τίνας ἔνεκεν παραγεγόνασιν
οἱ ξένοι 10 τὴν ξενίαν αὐτὴν τιμῶντες] *schol. δ* 33 *εἰ μὲν δὴ* ἡμεῖς πολλῶν
ἀγαθῶν ἐμπλησθέντες παρ' ἀλλοδαπῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἐνταῦθα παρεγενόμεθα, ὀφείλομεν πάντως
τοῖς ξένοις ὁμοίως ποιεῖν, unde Eustath. λόγος δὲ οὗτος εὐχαρίστον πλάνητος, ὁμολο-
γούντος τὴν ξενίαν 14 Il. 2,404 16 *Op.* 341 19 *fr. adesp.* 24
Diehl I²,3 p. 72, cfr *Trag. Graec. Fragm.*² *adesp.* 94, Crusius *GGA* 1890, p. 699,
Erasm. *Adag.* p. 43

8 πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν epitomator 17 βρωτικῆς A ἀροτικῆς epitomator, duobus
punctis superne adpositis C: correxit Iacobs

πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄλογον τόπω τὴν φιλίαν καὶ οὐ τρόπῳ κρῖνεσθαι; τοιγαροῦν 187 A
παρ' Ὀμήρῳ μετὰ τὸ πιεῖν·

3 τοῖς [δ'] ὁ γέρων πάμπρωτος ὑφαίνειν ἤρχετο μῆτιν,

παρὰ δὲ τοῖς οὐ τὰ σώφρονα συμπόσια συνάγουσι·

τοῖς δ' ὁ κόλαξ πάμπρωτος ὑφαίνειν ἤρχετο μῶκον.

6 VI. Ἔτι δὲ ὁ μὲν Ὀμηρος ἡλικίαις εἰσάγει διαφέροντας καὶ ταῖς προαι-
ρέσει τοὺς κεκλημένους, Νέστορα καὶ Αἴαντα καὶ Ὀδυσσεά, τὸ μὲν καθό-
λου σύμπαντας τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀντεχομένους, εἶδει δὲ διαφοροῖς ὁδοῖς ὠρμηκό- B
9 τας ἐπ' αὐτήν. ὁ δὲ Ἐπίκουρος ἅπαντας εἰσήγαγε προφήτας ἀτόμων καὶ
ταῦτ' ἔχων παραδείγματα τὴν τε τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῶν συμποσίων ποικιλίαν καὶ
τὴν Πλάτωνός τε καὶ Ξενοφώντος χάριν. ὧν ὁ μὲν Πλάτων τὸν μὲν Ἐρυ-
12 ξίμαχον ἱατρόν, τὸν δὲ Ἀριστοφάνη ποιητήν, ἄλλον δ' ἀπ' ἄλλης προαιρέ-
σεως σπονδάζοντας εἰσήγαγεν, Ξενοφῶν δὲ καὶ τινὰς ἰδιώτας συνανέμειξε. 177 A
πολλῶ τοίνυν κάλλιον Ὀμηρος ἐποίησε καὶ διάφορα παρατιθέμενος συμπό-
15 σια. πᾶν γὰρ ἐξ ἀντιπαραβολῆς ὁρᾶται μᾶλλον. ἔστιν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ μὲν B
τῶν μνηστήρων οἶον ἂν γένοιτο νεανίσκων μέθαις καὶ ἔρωςιν ἀνακειμένων,
τὸ δὲ τῶν Φαιάκων εὐσταθέστερον μὲν τούτων, φιλήδονον δέ. τοῦτοις δ'
18 ἀντέθηκε τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ στρατιᾷς, τὰ δὲ πολιτικώτερον τελούμενα σωφρόνως.
καὶ πάλιν αὖ διεῖλεν τὰ μὲν δημοθουλίαν ἔχοντα, τὰ δ' οἰκείων σύνοδον.
Ἐπίκουρος δὲ συμπόσιον φιλοσόφων μόνων πεποίηται.

3 Il. 7,324, 9,93 5 Brandt, *Parodorum epicorum Graec. rell.* (1888), p. 96,
a Meineke *Matronis Convivio Attico iniuria tribuitur.* 9 προφήτας ἀτόμων]
cfr Plat. *Phileb.* 28 B ἀπορῶ καὶ δέομαί γε, ὦ Σώκρατες, αὐτόν σε ἡμῶν γενέσθαι
προφήτην, Sext. *Emp. adv. Math.* I 53 ὁ προφήτης τῶν Πύρρωνος λόγων Τίμων,
Antiphan. *ap. Ath.* 623 C δέκνουν προφήτην 10 ποιητοῦ] sc. Ὀμήρου 13
ἰδιώτας] Xen. *Conv.* I 5 iocose αὐτουργούς τινὰς τῆς φιλοσοφίας, Plut. *Qu. conv.* p. 613
F ὀλίγοι τινὲς ἰδιῶται παρῶσιν ὥσπερ ἄφωνα γράμματα φωνηέντων ἐν μέσῳ πολλῶν
τῶν πεπαιδευμένων 15 ἐξ ἀντιπαραβολῆς ὁρᾶται μᾶλλον] similiter Dionys. Hal.
Ep. ad Cn. Pomph. 752 sqq. τὸ τῶν μνηστήρων] *Od.* I, 144—229
17 τὸ τῶν Φαιάκων] *Od.* 9, 1 18 ἐπὶ στρατιᾷς] *Il.* 7, 313 πολιτικώτερον]
Od. 4, 1 19 δημοθουλίαν] *Il.* 2, 398 οἰκείων σύνοδον] *Od.* 4, 1

1 ἄλογον] ἀτοπον epitomator 3 [δ'] delevi 5 ἤρχετο epitomator
8 ἦδει δε A 9 εἰς αὐτήν epitomator 9 καὶ] καίτοι malim
15 πᾶν Porson: πάλιν A om. epitomator, qui eandem foliorum confusionem atque
A praebebat sed propria turbatione auctam 20 μόνων A: corr. Usener

- 192 A Τὸ δὲ Πλάτωνος συμπόσιον οὐ συνέδριόν ἐστιν, οὐ βουλευτήριον, οὐ
λέσχην φιλοσόφων. Σωκράτης γὰρ οὐδὲ τοῦ συμποσίου ἀποστήναι θέλει
καίτοι Ἐρυξιμάχου καὶ Φαίδρου καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀποστάντων, ἀλλ' ἐργή- 3
γορε μετ' Ἀγάθωνος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους καὶ πίνει ἐξ ἀργυροῦ φρέατος —
καλῶς γὰρ τ ι ς τὰ μεγάλα ποτήρια οὕτως ὠνόμασε — πίνει τ' ἐκ τῆς
φιάλης ἐπιδέξια. φησὶ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο τοὺς μὲν δύο νυστάζειν, καταδαρ- 6
θεῖν δὲ πρότερον τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη, ἥδη δὲ ἡμέρας ὑποφαινούσης τὸν Ἀγά-
B θωνα· καὶ τὸν Σωκράτη κατακοιμήσαντα ἐκείνους ἀναστάντα ἀπιέναι εἰς
τὸ Λύκειον, ἐξόν, φησὶν ὁ Ἡ ρ ό δ ι κ ο ς, εἰς τοὺς Ὀμήρου Λαιστρυγόνας, 9

ἐνθα κ' ἄνπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοὺς ἐξήρατο μισθοῦς.

- V 4 VII. Ἐδίδαξεν δ' Ὀμηρος καὶ οὗς οὐ δεῖ καλεῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτομάτους ἵεναι,
177 C πρεπόντως ἐξ ἑνὸς τῶν ἀναγκαίων δεικνὺς τὴν τῶν ὁμοίων παρουσίαν 12

αὐτόματος δέ οἱ ἦλθε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος.

δῆλον γὰρ ὡς οὔτε ἀδελφὸν οὔτε γονέας οὔτε γυναικα κλητέον οὐτ' εἴ τις
ἰσοτιμῶς τινὰς τούτοις ἄγει· καὶ γὰρ ἂν ψυχρὸν εἶη καὶ ἄφιλον. 15

- V 5 Πλάτων δ' ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λέγει οὕτως· ἵνα καὶ τὴν
178 A παροιμίαν, φησί, διαφθείρωμεν μεταβάλλοντες, ὥς ἄρα καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐπὶ
δαίτας ἴσους αὐτόματοι ἀγαθοί. Ὀμηρος μὲν γὰρ κινδυνεύει οὐ μόνον 18
διαφθεῖραι ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑβρίσαι εἰς αὐτήν· ποιήσας γὰρ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἀγα-

1 συνέδριον] at cfr *Prot.* 317 D, de consilio belli Xen. *Hell.* I 1,31, de Areopago
Aesch. I 92 βουλευτήριον] cfr πολιτικώτερον 177 B et βουλαί 192 C

2 Σωκράτης] *Conv.* 223 BC 6 τις] Chamaeleon *fr.* 32 Köpke, cfr 461 C
καὶ μοι (sc. Χαμαιλέοντι) δοκοῦσι λέγειν οὐ κακῶς οἱ φάσκοντες, τὸ μέγα ποτήριον
φρέαρ ἀργυροῦν εἶναι, *Conv.* 223 C Ἀγάθωνα δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη καὶ Σωκράτη
ἐτι μόνους ἐργηγορέναι καὶ πίνειν ἐκ φιάλης μεγάλης ἐπὶ δεξιὰ 6 *Conv.* 223 D
αὐτοὺς . . . νυστάζειν καὶ πρῶτον μὲν καταδαρθεῖν τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη, ἥδη δ' ἡμέρας
γενομένης τὸν Ἀγάθωνα. τὸν οὖν Σωκράτη κατακοιμήσαντ' (vel -κοιμίσαντ') ἐκείνους
ἀναστάντ' ἀπιέναι . . . καὶ ἐλθόντα εἰς Λύκειον 10 *Od.* 10,84 nam ἐγγὺς γὰρ
νυκτός τε καὶ ἡματός εἰσι κέλευθοι 13 *Il.* 2,408 16 *Conv.* 174 B cum
schol.

1 ὁ συνέδριον A 12 πρεπόντων A om. epitomator : corr ζ 17
Ἀγάθων' (i. e. Ἀγάθωνι) fortasse iocatus est Socrates, sed non agnovit Herodicus
19 εἰς ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν Plato 19 Ἀγ. διαφερόντως ἀγαθὸν
ἄνδρα τὰ π., τὸν δὲ M. μαλθακὸν αἰχμητήν, θυσίαν ποιούμενον καὶ ἐστιῶντος τοῦ
Ἀ. ἄκλητον ἐποίησεν ἐλθόντα τὸν M. ἐπὶ τὴν θ ο ί ν η ν, χεῖρῳ ὄντα ἐπὶ τὴν
ἀμείνωνος Plato

θὸν τὰ πολεμικά, τὸν Μενέλαον δὲ μαλθακὸν αἰχμητήν, θυσίαν ποιουμένου 178 A
 τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος ἄκλητον ἐποίησεν ἐλθόντα τὸν χεῖρονα ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀμεί-
 3 νορος δίαίταν. Β ακχυλίδης δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους λέγων ὡς ἦλθεν B
 ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Κήνκος οἰκόν φησιν·

ἔσται δ' ἐπὶ λάινον οὐδόν, τοί δὲ θοίνας ἔντυον, ὧδέ τ' ἔφα·
 6 αὐτόματοι [δ'] ἀγαθῶν δαῖτας εὐόχθους ἐπέρχονται δίκαιοι
 φῶτες.

αἱ δὲ παροιμίαι ἡ μὲν φησιν·

9 αὐτόματοι δ' ἀγαθοὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐπὶ δαῖτας ἴασιν,
 ἡ δέ·

αὐτόματοι δ' ἀγαθοὶ δειλῶν ἐπὶ δαῖτας ἴασιν.

12 οὐ δεόντως γοῦν Πλάτων τὸν Μενέλεων ἐνόμισεν εἶναι δειλόν, ὃν ἀρηγίφιλον
 Ὅμηρος λέγει καὶ μόνον ὑπὲρ Πατρόκλου ἀριστεύσαντα καὶ τῷ Ἑκτορι C
 πρὸ πάντων πρόθυμον μονομαχεῖν, καίπερ ὄντα τῇ ῥώμῃ καταδεέστερον,
 15 ἔφ' οὗ μόνου τῶν στρατευσαμένων εἴρηκεν·

ἐν δ' αὐτὸς κίεν ἥσι προθυμίῃσι πεποιθώς.

εἰ δὲ ὁ ἐχθρὸς ὁ βλασφημῶν αὐτὸν εἴρηκε μαλθακὸν αἰχμητήν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο
 18 Πλάτων τῷ ὄντι μαλθακὸν αὐτὸν ὑπολαμβάνει, οὐκ ἂν φθάνοι καὶ τὸν
 Ἀγαμέμνονα τιθεὶς ἐν τοῖς φαύλοις, ὃν αὐτὸς φησιν εἶναι ἀγαθόν, εἴπερ εἰς
 αὐτὸν εἴρηται τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος· D

21 οἰνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων, κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο.

οὐ γὰρ εἴ τι λέγεται παρ' Ὅμηρῳ, τοῦθ' Ὅμηρος λέγει. πῶς γὰρ ἂν εἴη
 μαλθακὸς Μενέλαος ὁ τὸν Ἑκτορα μόνος ἀπειρώξας τοῦ Πατρόκλου καὶ
 24 Εὐφορβον ἀποκτείνας τε καὶ σκυλεύσας ἐν μέσοις τοῖς Τρωσί. τὸ δὲ μηδὲ

5 Bacchyl. fr. 33 B 8 proverbium e loco Bacchyl. refert Zenob. II 19, de
 re Apollodor. bibl. II 7,6 13 ἀριστεύσαντα] Il. 17,1 14 μονομαχεῖν]
 Il. 7,94 16 Il. 2,588 17 αἰχμητήν] Il. 17,588 21 Il. 1,225

1 πολέμια A epitomator 4 περὶ τοῦ Κήνκος A om. epitomator: corr.
 Schweighäuser 5 ἔντυον et ἔφας A: corr. Neue 6 [δ'] Brunck
 12 γοῦν] δέ epitomator Μενέλεων mirror 14 προθυμῶν μονομαχεῖ A
 17 ὁ ἀσχερὸς βλασφημῶν epitomator

178 E τὸν σίχον, ὃν ἡτιᾶτο, τελείως κατανοῆσαι ἄτοπον, δι' οὗ βοήν ἀγαθὸς Μενέ-
λαος λέγεται. τοῖς γὰρ ἀνδρειοτάτοις "Ομηρος εἴωθεν ἐπιφωνεῖν, καλούν-
των τῶν παλαιῶν τὸν πόλεμον βοήν.

3

V 6 VIII. Πάντα δ' ὧν ἀκριβὴς "Ομηρος καὶ τὸ μικρὸν τοῦτο σὺ παρέλιπε
τὸ δεῖν θεραπεύσαντα τὸ σωματίον καὶ λουσάμενον ἵνα πρὸς τὸ δεῖπνον.
ἐπὶ γοῦν τοῦ "Οδυσσεὺς εἶπε πρὸ τῆς παρὰ Φαίαξι θοῆνης·

6

αὐτόδιον δ' ἄρα μιν ταμίη λούσασθαι ἄνωγεν.

F ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν περὶ Τηλέμαχον·

ἔς ῥ' ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐνξέστας λούσαντο.

9

ἄπρεπές γὰρ ἦν, φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης, ἦκειν εἰς τὸ συμπόσιον σὺν
ἰδρωτί πολλῷ καὶ κονιορτῷ. δεῖ γὰρ τὸν χαρίεντα μῆτε ἔνπᾶν μῆτε
αὐχμεῖν μῆτε βορβόρῳ χαιρεῖν καθ' Ἡράκλειτον.

12

IX. Δεῖ καὶ τὸν πρῶτον εἰς ἄλλοτρίαν οἰκίαν ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ δεῖπνον
179 A μὴ γαστρισόμενον εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὸ συμπόσιον χωρεῖν, ἀλλὰ τι δοῦναι πρότερον
τῷ φιλοθεάμονι καὶ κατανοῆσαι τὴν οἰκίαν. οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο παρέλιπεν ὁ
ποιητής·

3 πόλεμον βοήν] similiter explicant scholiastae ad 17,588 πρέποντας πολέμιον τοὺς
λόγους περιτέθεικεν ὁ ποιητής, ἐπεὶ τοῖ γε οὐκ οἶδε δειλὸν τὸν Μενέλαον· βοήν γὰρ
ἀγαθὸν πανταχοῦ καλεῖ αὐτόν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν μάχῃ ἀνδρεῖον. τὸ σημεῖον, ὅτι οὐχ
ὥς τῷ ὄντι μαλθακοῦ αἰχμητοῦ ὄντος τοῦ Μενελάου ληπτέον, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσωπον
πολέμιον ὃν εἰς διαβολὴν λέγει· ἀρηϊφίλον γὰρ ὁ ποιητής αὐτόν καλεῖ Schol. T

brevissime μαλθακός: οὐ πιστὸς ὁ νόμος 5 λουσάμενον] Ath. 24 D οἱ γοῦν
ἀπὸ τῆς σκοπιῆς ἐπανελθόντες ἰδρῶ πολλὸν ἀπενίζοντο θαλάσση κνήμας ἡδὲ λόφον
ἀμφὶ τε μηρούς (Il. 10,572) καὶ οὕτως ἀναψύξαντες ἔς ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐνξέστας
λούσαντο καὶ ἀλειφάμενοι λίπ' ἐλαίῳ δέλπνῳ ἐφιζανέτην (Il. 10,576), eadem affert
[Plut.] quaest. hom. 209, aliter Ath. 18 F παρατηρητέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἐν μὲν "Οδυσσεῖα
ἀπονιζομένους τὰς χεῖρας ποιεῖ πρὶν μεταλαβεῖν τῆς τροφῆς, ἐν Ἰλιάδι δὲ τοῦτο
ποιοῦντας οὐκ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν. σχολαζόντων γὰρ βίος ὁ ἐν "Οδυσσεῖα καὶ διὰ τὴν
εἰρήνην τρυφῶντων.

7 Od. 8,449

9 Od. 4,48

10 Aristot. fr.

100 Rose

12 Heraclit. fr. B 13 Diels, qui confert Colum. VIII 4 si modo

credimus Ephesio Heracleto sues caeno... lavari et Democr. fr. B 147 σῦες ἐπὶ
φορτῷ μαργαίνουσιν 15 Schol. Vesp. 1214 ἐπαίνεσόν τι τῶν χαλκωμάτων]

ὅτι οἱ ἐν συμποσίοις ἀνακείμενοι πρὸ τοῦ προσφάγια εἰσενεχθῆναι ἐπαινοῦσι τὰ ἐν
τῇ οἰκίᾳ σκεύη καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ.

6 γοῦν epitomator: τ' οὖν A 7 ἀνώγειν Hom.

14 γαστριζόμενον

Kaibel γαστρισαμένους ap. Eustath. 1482,60

αὐτοὶ δ' εἰσῆλθον θεῖον δόμον· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες 179 A
θαύμαζον κατὰ δῶμα διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος.
3 ὥς τε γὰρ ἡελίου αἴγλη πέλεν ἢ σελήνης
δῶμα καθ' ὑπερεφές Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο.

καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Σφηξὶ ποιεῖ τὸν ἄγριον γέροντα καὶ φιλοδι-
6 καστὴν καταρρυθμιζόμενον εἰς βίον ἡμερον ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδός· B

παῦ· ἀλλὰ δευρὶ κατακλινεῖς προσμάνθανε
ξυμποτικός εἶναι καὶ ξυνουσιαστικός.

9 διδάξας τε αὐτὸν ὥς δεῖ κατακλίνεσθαί φησιν·

ἔπειτ' ἐπαίνεσόν τι τῶν χαλκωμάτων,
ὄροφῆν θέασαι, κρεκάδι' ἀνλῆς θαύμασον·

12 X. Καὶ πρὸ τοῦ θοινᾶσθαι δὲ ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν ἡμᾶς διδάσκει πάλιν Ὅμηρος, V 7
ἀπαρχὰς τῶν βρωμάτων νέμειν τοῖς θεοῖς. οἱ γοῦν περὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεά καί-
περ ὄντες ἐν τῷ τοῦ Κύκλωπος σπηλαίῳ· C

15 ἐνθα δὲ πῦρ κείαντες ἐθύσαμεν ἡδὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
τυρῶν αἰνύμενοι φάγομεν.

καὶ ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς καίπερ ἐπειγομένων τῶν πρέσβων ὥς ἐν μέσαις νυξὶν
18 ἡκόντων ὅμως·

θεοῖσι δὲ θῆσαι ἀνώγει
Πάτροκλον δν ἑταῖρον· ὁ δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε θνητάς.

21 καὶ σπονδοποιεῖται γε τοὺς δαιτυμόνας·

κοῦροι μὲν κρητῆρας ἐπεσιτέψαντο ποτοῖο,
νόμησαν δ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπαρξάμενοι δεπάεσσιν.
24 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε.

1 Od. 4, 43

5 Vesf. 1208, 1214

15 Od. 9, 231

19 Il. 9, 219

22 Il. 9, 175

1 αὐτοὺς δ' εἰσῆγον Hom.

4 ὑπερεφές A

7 προμάνθανε Dobree

15 ἐνθάδε A κήαντες melius

19 ἀνώγειν Hom.

21 σπονδο-

ποιεῖσθαι λέγει τοὺς mavult Kaibel

22 μὲν Herodicus δὲ Hom.

179 D ἄπερ καὶ Πλάτων φυλάσσει κατὰ τὸ συμπόσιον. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ δειπνῆσαι σπονδὰς τέ φησιν ποιῆσαι καὶ τὸν θεὸν παιωνίσαντας τοῖς νομιζομένοις γέρασι. παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ Ξενοφῶν. παρὰ δ' Ἐπικούρω οὐ σπονδή, 3 οὐκ ἀπαρχή θεοῖς, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ Σιμωνίδης ἔφη περὶ τῆς ἀκόσμου γυναικός,

ἄθυστα δ' ἰρὰ πολλάκις κατεσθίει.

6

V 8, E XI. Τὴν δὲ σύμμετρον κραῖσιν τοῦ οἴνου ὑπὸ Ἀμφικτύονος βασιλεύσαντος διδασχθῆναι φασιν Ἀθηναίους, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἱερὸν Διονύσου ὀρθοῦ ἰδρύσασθαι. τότε γὰρ ὀρθός ἐστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ οὐ σφαλερός, ὅταν συμμέτρως καὶ 9 κεκραμένως πίνηται.

οἶνος γὰρ ἀνώγει

ἡλεός, ὅς τ' ἔφθέκε πολύφρονά περ μάλ' ἀεῖσαι

12

καὶ θ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσαι καὶ τ' ὀρχήσασθαι ἀνῆκεν

179 F

καὶ τε ἔπος προέηκεν ὅπερ τ' ἄρρητον ἄμεινον.

I *Conv.* 176 A μετὰ ταῦτα . . . σπονδὰς τε σφᾶς ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἔσσαντας τὸν θεὸν καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα τρέπεσθαι πρὸς τὸν πότον 3 *Xen. Conv.*
II 1 ἔσπεισαν καὶ ἐπαιάνισαν 7 *Semon. fr.* 7,56 *Diehl* 7 *Ath.* 10 C
οἶδε δὲ ὁ Ὅμηρος καὶ τὸ ὠφέλιμον καὶ τὸ σύμμετρον τοῦ οἴνου . . . καὶ κραάσεων γένη. *Philochorus ap. Ath.* 38 C, *FHG* I 387. *Φιλόχορος* δὲ φησιν Ἀμφικτύονα τὸν Ἀθηναίων βασιλέα μαθόντα παρὰ Διονύσου τὴν τοῦ οἴνου κραῖσιν πρῶτον κραάσαι. διὸ καὶ ὀρθοὺς γενέσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὕτω πίνοντας, πρότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀκράτου καμπτομένους· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἰδρύσασθαι βωμὸν ὀρθοῦ Διονύσου (*Mayer, Athen. Mitt.* 17 (1892), 265 sqq. = Ἀκρατος) ἐν τῷ τῶν Ὠρῶν ἱερῷ· αὐταὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀμπέλου καρπὸν ἐκτρέφουσι. *Fabulam primus narravit Theophrastus ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης, fr.* 123 *Wimmer*, repetivit *Philochorus ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀτθίδος, profusius postea Philonides ap. Ath.* 675 A—C 11 *Od.* 14,463—465
12 ἡλεός] *schol.* ἡλυθιοποιός, μάταιος quod refutat *Eustathius* aliis *scholiis* nisus. *Idem* hunc locum affert p. 1770,1 οὐ γὰρ οὕτω, φασίν, οἶδεν Ὅμηρος τὸν οἶνον ἡλεόν, ὥς ἡλίθιον καὶ ματαιοποιόν, οὐδ' οὕτως ἀγροϊκὸς οὐδ' ἐπαρίστερός ἐστιν, ὥς κελεύειν σκυθρωπὸν εἶναι τὸν πίνοντα μήτε ἄδοντα μήτε γελῶντα μήτ' εὐρύθμως ποτὲ καὶ πρὸς ὀρχησιν τρεφόμενον, ἀλλ' ἥδει ἐν ἐκάστῳ τούτων διαφορὰν ποιότητος καὶ ποσότητος. διὸ καὶ κωλύσας τὸ μᾶλα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄδειν καὶ γελαῖν καὶ ὀρχεῖσθαι καὶ τὴν ἐκείθεν ἀνανδρον, φασί, πρόπτωσιν· ἐφίησιν ἄλλως αὐτὰ συμμέτρως γίνεσθαι διὰ

6 ἄθυστα A : corr. e *Stob. fl.* 73,61.
Διονύσου epitomator et lemma A

7 δέ epitomator: γάρ A
14 καὶ τι Hom.

8 ὀρθοῦ

τὸν γὰρ οἶνον Ὅμηρος οὐκ ἤλεον ὥσπερ ἡλίθιον καλεῖ καὶ ματαιοποιόν, 179 F
 οὐδὲ κελεύει σκυθρωπὸν εἶναι μήτε ἄδοντα μήτε γελῶντα μήτ' ἐρρύθμως
 3 ποτὲ καὶ πρὸς ὄρχησιν τρεπόμενον· οὐχ οὕτως ἀγροῖκος οὐδ' ἐπαρίστερός
 ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἥδει τούτων ἐκάστου καὶ ποσότητος καὶ ποιότητος διαφορὰν.
 ὅθεν οὐκ εἶπεν ὡς ἄρα τὸν πολύφρονα ὁ οἶνος ποιεῖ ἄσαι, ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἀεῖσαι, 180 A
 6 τουτέστιν ἀμέτρως καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖον ὥστε προσοχλεῖν· οὐδέ τι γελάσαι μὰ
 Δί' οὐδ' ὀρχήσασθαι· κοινὸν δ' ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων λαβὼν τὸ ἀπαλὸν τὴν ἀναν-
 δρον εἰς τοῦτο πρόπτωσιν ἐπιστομίζει·

9 καὶ θ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσαι καὶ τ' ὀρχήσασθαι ἀνῆκεν.

παρὰ δὲ τῷ Πλάτῳ τούτων οὐδὲν ἔμμετρον, ἀλλὰ πίνουνσι μὲν τοσοῦτον
 ὥστε μὴδὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις ποσὶν ἴστασθαι. ὅρα γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ κωμον Ἀλκιβιάδην
 12 ὡς ἀσχημονεῖ· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι τὸν ὀκτακότυλον ψυκτῆρα πίνουνσι προφάσεως
 λαβόμενοι ἐπέπερ αὐτοὺς προεἰλκυσεν Ἀλκιβιάδης οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ·

15 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ' ἐπιὸν θ' ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός.

τούτων οὖν ἃ μὲν καθάπαξ περιγραπτέον, οἷς δὲ συμμέτρως χρηστέον ὥσπερ
 ἀναθήμασί τισι μικρὸν προσαποβλέψαντες, καθάπερ Ὅμηρος εἴρηκεν·

18 μολπή τ' ὀρχηστὺς τε· τὰ γάρ τ' ἀναθήματα δαιτός.

τὸ δ' ὅλον τὸ πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα νενευκὸς τοῖς μνηστῆρσι καὶ τοῖς Φαίαισιν V 9
 ἔνειμεν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ Νέστορι οὐδὲ Μενελάῳ.

τοῦ 'πίνειν' (Ὀμηρικῶς εἰπεῖν) ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός· εἰ καὶ οἱ παρὰ Πλάτῳ οὐχ οὕτω,
 φασί, πίνουνσιν ἀλλ' ὥστε μὴδὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις ποσὶν ἴστασθαι, οἳ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἂν ὀρχεῖσθαι
 δύναιντο, ἀλλ' ἴσως οὐδὲ ζῆν. 1 ματαιοποιόν Et. M. 425, 59 7 κοινόν]
 haud recte interpretatur Herodicus 10 cfr. Cony. 213 A 12 ψυκτῆρα]
 Alcibiades hausit 214 A 20 immo Νέστορα πίνοντα ἔμπης Il. 14, 1, de quo
 Ath. 433 B πλεῖστον δ' ἐπὶ τῶν μὲν ἡρώων Νέστορ ὁ τριγέρον· φανερώς γὰρ αὐτὸς
 προσέκειτο τῶν ἄλλων μᾶλλον τῷ οἴνῳ καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος αὐτοῦ, ὃν ὡς πολυπότην
 ἐπιπλήσσει ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς, Il. 1, 225.

2 ἐρρύθμως A εὐρύθμως epitomator
 οὐδέ τι epitomator· οὐδ' ἔτι A
 πρὸς epitomator

6 ὥστε Coraes : ὥσπερ codd.
 11 ὄραϊ A: corr. Musurus 19 ὅλον

V 12, 182 B XII. Ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἐπικουρείῳ συμποσίῳ κολάκων ἐστὶν ἄγνους ἀλλήλους ἐπαινούσων, τὸ δὲ Πλάτωνος πλήρῆς ἐστὶν μυκτηριστῶν ἀλλήλους τωθα-ζόντων· τὸν γὰρ περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου λόγον σιωπῶ. παρὰ δ' Ὀμήρῳ συγκε- 3 κρότῃται τὰ σώφρονα συμπόσια. καὶ ποτε μὲν ἐπήνεσέ τις φήσας πρὸς τὸν Μενέλαον ὥς οὐ τολμᾷ λέγειν·

B ἄντα σέθεν, τοῦ νῶι θεοῦ ὥς τερπόμεθ' αὐδοῇ. 6

ὁ δ' ἐπελάβετό τινος τῶν οὐκ ὀρθῶς λεγομένων ἢ γιγνομένων·

καὶ νῦν, εἴ τί που ἔστι, πίθοιό μοι· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε 9
τέρπομ' ὀδυρόμενος μεταδόρπιος.

ὁ δὲ πάλιν·

Τηλέμαχε, ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

οὔτε γὰρ κόλακα πρόπον ἐστὶν εἶναι οὔτε μυκτηριστήν. 12

187 C XIII. Πάλιν Ἐπίκουρος ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ ζητεῖ περὶ δυσπεψίας ὥστ' οἰωνίσασθαι, εἰθ' ἑξῆς περὶ πυρετῶν. τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐπιτρέχουσαν τῇ λέξει ἀρρηθμίαν τί δεῖ καὶ λέγειν; Πλάτων δέ — τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς λυγρὸς ὀχλοῦ- 15 μενον καὶ θεραπευόμενον ἀνακογχυλιασμοῖς ὕδατος, ἔτι δὲ ταῖς ὑποθήκαις τοῦ κάρφους ἵνα τὴν ῥῖνα κινήσας πτάρῃ, παρήμει· κωμωδεῖν γὰρ ἤθελε καὶ διασύρειν — χλευάζει τε τὰ ἰσόκωλα τὰ Ἀγάθωνος καὶ τὰ ἀντίθετα, καὶ 18

4 Pollux VI 8 συμπόσιον συγκροτῆσαι, cfr Plut. *de cup. div.* 10 p. 528 B = συνάγειν σώφρονα συμπόσια] cfr 187 A σώφρονα συμπόσια 4 τις] de Telemacho Pisistratus *Od.* 4, 160 8 *Od.* 4, 193—4 11 *Od.* 3, 230 15 ἀρρηθμίαν] cfr Diog. Laert. X 13 κέχρηται δὲ λέξει κυρία κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἣν ὅτι ἰδιωτικω-τάτη ἐστὶν Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς αἰτιᾶται, confirmat Cic. *de fin.* I 5, 15, deridet Plut. *adv. Colot.* 1116 E τοὺς ἀκριβέστερον ἐλληνίζοντας καὶ καθαρώτερον διαλεγόμενους = Diog. Laert. X 7, exaggerat Sext. *Emp. adv. Math.* 215, 1 dicendo ἐν πολλοῖς ἀμαθῆς Ἐπίκουρος, οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς ὁμιλίαις καθαρεύων 16 ἀνακογχυλιασμοῖς] *Conv.* 185 E 18 χλευάζει] *Conv.* 198 A

1 ἐπι κούρωι A ἑπικουρίου lemma, ἐπικούρου epitomator: corr. Kaibel 3 συγκεκρότῃται Casaubonus: κεκρότῃται codd. 5 τολμᾷ A 11 ἐδόν-των A 16 ἔτι δὲ Dindorf: ἐν δὲ codd.

- τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην δὲ παράγει λέγοντα ὅτι πασχητιᾶ. ἀλλ' ὅμως τοιαῦτα
 γράφοντες τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐκβάλλουσι τῶν πόλεων. ἀλλ' οὐτ' ἐκ θύμβρας, 187 D
 3 ἔφη Διημοχάρης, λόγῳ οὐτ' ἐκ τοιούτων λόγων ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται.
 Οὐ μόνον δ' Ἀλκιβιάδην διασύρει ἀλλὰ καὶ Χαρμίδην καὶ Εὐθύδημον καὶ
 ἄλλους πολλοὺς τῶν νέων. τοῦτο δὲ κωμωδοῦντός ἐστι τὴν Ἀθηναίων
 6 πόλιν, τὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος μουσεῖον, ἣν ὁ μὲν Πίνδαρος Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα
 ἔφη, Θουκυδίδης δ' ἐν τῷ εἰς Εὐριπίδην ἐπιγράμματι Ἑλλάδος
 Ἑλλάδα, ὁ δὲ Πύθιος ἐστὶν καὶ πρυτανεῖον τῶν Ἑλλήνων. διότι E
 9 τοῖνυν κατέφρευται τῶν νεανίσκων πάρεστι σκοπεῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ
 Πλάτωνος. τὸν μὲν γὰρ Ἀλκιβιάδην φησὶν ἐν τῷ ὁμωνύμῳ διαλόγῳ
 παρακμάσαντα τότε πρῶτον ἄρξασθαι Σωκράτει λαλεῖν, ὅτε πάντες αὐτὸν
 12 κατέλιπον οἱ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμηταί. λέγει γὰρ ταῦτα κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ
 διαλόγου. τὰ δ' ἐν τῷ Χαρμίδῃ ἐναντιώματα ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ διαλόγου ὁ
 βουλόμενος εἴσεται. ποιεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀσυμφώνως ποτὲ μὲν σκοτοδινιώντα
 15 καὶ μεθυσκόμενον τῷ τοῦ παιδὸς ἔρωτι καὶ γινόμενον ἕξεδρον καὶ καθάπερ F
 νεβρὸν ὑποπεπιτωκότα λόντος ἀλκῇ, ἅμα δὲ καταφρονεῖν φησι τῆς ὥρας
 αὐτοῦ.
 18 Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ Ξενοφῶντος Συμπόσιον καίπερ ἐπαινούμενον οὐκ ἐλάτ- V 13
 τους ἔχει τούτων ἐπιλήψεις. Καλλίας μὲν γὰρ συνάγει τὸ συμπόσιον, ἐπει-
 δήπερ τὰ παιδικὰ αὐτοῦ Αὐτόλυκος Παναθήναια παγκράτιον ἐστεφανώθη.
 21 καὶ εὐθὺς οἱ κατακλιθέντες τῷ παιδί προσέχουσι τὸν νοῦν καὶ ταῦτα τοῦ 188
 πατρὸς παρακαθημένου. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὅταν φέγγος ἐν νυκτὶ παρῇ, πάντων
 προσάγεται τὰ ὄμματα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Αὐτολύκου κάλλος πάντων ἐφέλκεται

1 πασχητιᾶ] *Conv.* 218 C sqq 2 cfr Ὅμηρον ἐκβάλλον 505 B idem
 prov. affert Herodicus 215 E, non e quovis ligno fit Mercurius contulit Erasmus

5 X. καὶ Ἑ.] *Conv.* 222 B καὶ ἄλλους πάνν πολλοὺς ratione sua inter-
 pretatus est Herodicus 7 Pind. fr. 76 celeberrimum, testimonia collegit

Boeckh II: 2 p. 579 sqq 8 Θουκυδίδης] Diehl I² 1, p. 134 ex *Anth. Pal.* VII 45

μνήμα μὲν Ἑλλάς ἅπασ' Εὐριπίδου· ὅσπερ δ' ἴσχει γῆ Μακεδόν, ἥπερ δέξατο τέρμα
 βίον. πατρὶς δ' Ἑλλάδος Ἑλλάς, Ἀθηναί· πλεῖστα δὲ Μούσαις τέρας ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ
 τὸν ἐπαινον ἔχει qui scripsit imitatus est epigr. Aeschyl. (fr. 3 Diehl); innuit Thuc.
 II 41, 1 et 43, 3, uide Th. Preger, *Inscr. Gr. metr.*, Leipz. 1891, p. 207 9 ὁ δὲ

Πύθιος] Ael. *Var. hist.* IV 6 ἦν ἵκα ἐβούλοντο Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἀφανίσαι
 πόλιν, ἠρώτησαν τὸν θεόν· καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο τὴν κοινὴν ἐστὶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος μὴ κινεῖν,
 Ath. 254 B ἦν ὁ μὲν Πύθιος ἐστὶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀνεκήρυξε, πρυτανεῖον δὲ Ἑλλάδος
 ὁ δυσμενέστατος Θεόπομπος (*Fr Gr Hist* 281 = F H G 297) 11 ἐν τῷ ὁμωνύμῳ]

Alc. 103 A 14 ἐν τῷ Χαρμίδῃ] 155 C D 23 Xen. *Conv.* I 9

1 δὲ vituperavit Kaibel 23 παρῇ: φανῇ Xen. 24 καὶ τότε τοῦ A.
 τὸ κάλλος πάντων εἴλκε τὰς ὄψεις αὐτόν· ἐπειτα τῶν ὁρώντων οὐδεὶς οὐχ
 ἐπασχέ — σιωπηρότεροι — πῶς Xenophon

- 188 A τὰς ὄφεις ἐφ' ἑαυτό. ἔπειτα τῶν παρόντων οὐδεὶς ἦν ὃς οὐκ ἔπασχέ τι τὴν
 ψυχὴν ὑπ' ἐκείνου· οἱ μὲν γε σιωπηλότεροι ἐγίγνοντο, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐσχηματί- 3
 ζοντό πως.
 Ἄλλ' οὐχ Ὅμηρος τοιοῦτόν τι εἶπεῖν ἐπεχείρησε καίτερ τῆς Ἑλένης
 παρούσης, περὶ ἧς τοῦ κάλλους τις τῶν ἐναντίων αὐτῇ τοιαῦτ' εἶπεν ὑπὸ 6
 τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκνικώμενος·

- B οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐυκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
 τοιγῷδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν· 9
 αἰνῶς ἀθανάτησι θεῇσ' εἰς ὧπα ἔοικεν.

εἰτά φησιν·

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς τοίηπερ ἐοῦσ' ἐν νηυσὶ νέεσθω.

- τὰ δὲ μειράκια τὰ ὥς τὸν Μενέλαον παραγενόμενα, ὁ Νέστορος υἱὸς καὶ ὁ 12
 Τηλέμαχος, ἐν οἴνῳ ὄντες καὶ ἐν γαμικῷ συμποσίῳ διατρίβοντες καὶ τῆς
 C Ἑλένης παρακαθημένης, ὥς πρέπον ἐστίν, ἡσυχίαν ἄγοντες πρὸς τὸ περι-
 βόητον ἐκκεκωφωμένοι κάλλος. ὁ δὲ Σωκράτης τίνος χάριν, τῶν αὐλητρί- 15
 δων ἀνεχόμενος καὶ τοῦ ὀρχουμένου παιδὸς καὶ καθαρίζοντος ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς
 κυβιστώσης γυναικὸς, ἀπρεπῶς τὸ μῦρον ἀπείπατο; οὐδεὶς γάρ ἄν αὐτοῦ
 ἀγελαστὶ ἠνέσχετο κατὰ νοῦν ἔχων ταῦτα τὰ ἔπη· 18

τοὺς ὠχριῶντας, τοὺς ἀνυποδήτους λέγεις,
 ὧν ὁ κακοδαίμων Σωκράτης καὶ Χαιρεφῶν.

- D καὶ μὴν ἀσύμφωνα καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα τῇ αὐστηρότητι. ὁ γὰρ δὴ Κριτό- 21
 βουλος, μειράκιον ἀστεῖον, γέροντα <ὄντα> καὶ διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ τὸν Σω-
 κράτη σκώπτει πολὺ τῶν Σιληνῶν αἰσχίονα λέγων εἶναι. ὁ δὲ αὐτῷ δια-

7 Il. 3, 156

Nub. 103

12 Od. 4, 1

23 σκώπτει Xen. Conv. 4, 19

15 Xen. Conv. 2, 3

19 Aristoph.

2 ἐσχηματίζόν πως A om. epitomator

5 περὶ ἧς Dindorf: περὶ τῆς codd.

τοὺς ἐνερόχρωτας Nauck

4 καίτερ epitomator καὶ περὶ A

19 τοὺς ὠτας τοὺς A om. C:

22 <ὄντα> Kaibel

μορφοσκοπεῖται καὶ κριτὰς ἐλόμενος τὸν τε παῖδα καὶ τὴν ὀρχηστρίδα προ- 188 D
τίθησι νικητήρια φιλήματα τῶν κριτῶν. τίς οὖν τῶν νέων ἐντυχὼν τούτοις

3 οὐκ ἐπιτριβήσεται μᾶλλον ἥπερ εἰς ἀρετὴν προαχθείη;

Παρὰ δ' Ὀμήρῳ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Μενελάου συμποσίῳ προβάλλουσιν ἀλλή- V 14
λοις ὥσπερ ἐν διατριβῇ ζητήματα καὶ πολιτικῶς ὁμιλοῦντες τέρπουσιν ἀλ-
6 λήλους καὶ ἡμᾶς. ὁ γοῦν Μενέλαος παραγενομένων ἐκ τοῦ λουτρῶνος τῶν E
περὶ τὸν Τηλέμαχον καὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν ἐδωδὴν παρατεθέντων παρακαλεῖ
μεταλαμβάνειν λέγων τάδε·

9 οἶτον δ' ἄπιεσθον καὶ χαίρετον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
δείτνου παυσαμένῳ εἰρησόμεθ' οἷτινες ἐστὸν.

ἔπειτα προσεπιδίδωσι τῶν παρακειμένων αὐτῷ φιλανθρωπενόμενος·

12 ὥς φατο καὶ σφιν νῶτα βοὸς παρὰ πίονα θῆκεν
ὅπτι' ἐν χερσὶν ἐλὼν, τὰ ῥά οἱ γέρεα πάρθεσαν αὐτῷ. F

φαγόντες δ' ἐκεῖνοι μετὰ σιωπῆς, ὡς πρέπει νέοις, ἀλλήλοις ὁμιλοῦσιν ἡρέμα
15 προσκλήναντες οὐ περὶ ἐδεσμάτων, φησὶν, οὐδὲ <τῶν> θεραπαιῶν τοῦ κεκλη-
κότος ὕφ' ὧν ἐλούσαντο, περὶ δὲ τῶν κτημάτων τοῦ ὑποδεξαμένου·

Ζηνὸς που τοιγδε γ' Ὀλυμπίου ἐνδοθεν αὐλή.

18 XIV. Διδάσκει δ' ἡμᾶς Ὀμηρος ὅτι δεῖ καὶ τοὺς κεκλημένους ἐφ' ἐστί- V 18, 191 D
ασιν παρακαλεῖν ἀπανίστασθαι τοὺς κεκληκότας. ὁ μὲν Τηλέμαχος τὸν
Μενέλαον·

21 ἀλλ' ἄγετ' εἰς εὐνὴν τράπεθ' ἡμέας, ὄφρα καὶ ἤδη
ὑπνῷ ὑπο γλυκερῷ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες.

ἡ δὲ προσποιουμένη Μέντωρ εἶναι Ἀθηναῖα πρὸς τὸν Νέστορα·

5 πολιτικῶς] cfr 177 B πολιτικώτερον — σωφρόνως 9 Od. 4,60
12 Od. 4,65 17 Od. 4,74 21 Od. 4,294, προτρεπτικὸν εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν
add. Eustath.

3 <ἄν> Kaibel προαχθήσεται Wilamowitz 9 δ'] θ' Hom. 10 παν-
σαμένον A πασσαμένῳ Hom.

191 E

ἀλλ' ἄγε τάμνετε μὲν γλώσσας, κεράσασθε δὲ οἶνον,
 ὄφρα Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν
 σπείσαντες κοίτοιο μεδώμεθα τοῖο γὰρ ὄρη.

3

ἐν δὲ ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἑορταῖς οὐδ' ὅσιον εἶναι δοκεῖ πλείω χρόνον παραμέ-
 νειν. γνωμικῶς γοῦν φησι παρὰ τῷ Ὀμήρῳ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ

ἤδη γὰρ φάος οἴχεθ' ὑπὸ ζόφον, οὐδὲ ἔοικε
 δηθὰ θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ θαασσέμεν, ἀλλὰ νέεσθαι.

6

F Καὶ νῦν δὴ νόμος ἐκ θυσιῶν τινων πρὸ ἡλίου δύνοντος ἀπιέναι. καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν σακρουνικῶς διεξήγετο τὸ τῶν συμποσίων γένος, 9
 καθάπερ εἴρηκεν Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ περὶ τούτων γεγραφώς. καθήμενοι γὰρ ἐδείκνουν, τροφῇ τῇ λιτοτάτῃ καὶ ὑγιεινοτάτῃ χρώμενοι καὶ οἶνω τοσούτῳ ὅσος ἱκανὸς ἂν γένοιτο πρὸς εὐθυμίαν, ἣν ὁ Πίνδαρος αἰτεῖται παρὰ τοῦ 12
 Διός·

τί ἔρδων φίλος
 σοί τε, καρτερόβροντα Κρονίδα, φίλος δὲ Μοίσαις
 Εὐθυμία τε μέλων <κεν> εἶην,
 τοῦτ' αἵτημί σε.

15

1 *Od.* 3,332

10 Ἀπολλώνιος] fortasse Letopolitanus ille, de quo vide Cohn
R E II 134 n. 73. 14 *Pind. fr.* 155, 24 ap. Boeckh, allatum iisdem vitiis
 corruptum ab Eustathio in *Od.* 4,179

1 κεράσασθε vel κεράεσθε Hom.
 <κεν> Kaibel

16 μελῶν codd: corr. Casaubonus

IV. THE *KΩΜΩΙΔΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ* AND THE OTHER WRITINGS

The standard work of Herodicus, now lost, is his lexical compilation *Κωμωδούμενοι*. This was a sort of reference list of all those who were mentioned in the plays of the old and middle comedy. Plutarch tells us how necessary these dictionaries were for the student of the ancient literature¹: just as at great banquets every guest has a cupbearer of his own, so everybody needs a grammarian to explain *τίς τῶν κωμωδουμένων ἕκαστος*. Steinhausen, who introduces his dissertation² with this quotation, has at length dealt with the matter and there is not much to add to his excellent work. Owing to the nature of the material, which makes it impossible to state if the information comes from Herodicus, Ammonius, or Aristarchus, only those fragments where the author is expressly quoted, can be assigned to a certain work. The sure fragments of the *Κωμωδούμενοι* are the following three.

1. ATHENAEVS 586 A = HARPOCRATIO s. v. *Συνώπη*.

Καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς Συνώπης Ἡρόδικος ὁ Κρατήτειος ἐν ζ' Κωμωδουμένων φησὶν ὅτι Ἀβυδὸς ἐλέγετο διὰ τὸ γράψαι εἶναι. μνημονεύει δ' αὐτῆς Ἀντιφάνης ἐν Ἀρκάδι καὶ ἐν Κηπουρῶ, ἐν Ἀκестρίᾳ, ἐν Ἀλιευμένῃ, ἐν Νεότιδι, καὶ Ἀλεξίς ἐν Κλεοβουλίνῃ καὶ Καλλικράτης ἐν Μοσχίῳ.

1 ἐν γ' Harpocratio

¹ *Quaest. conv.* VII 8, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμονικοῖς δείπνοις ἑκάστῳ παρέστηκε τῶν κατακειμένων οἰνοχόος, οὕτω δεήσει γραμματικὸν ἑκάστῳ τὸ καθ' ἑαστον ἐξηγεῖσθαι, τίς ὁ Λαοποδίας παρ' Εὐπόλιδι καὶ ὁ Κνησίας παρὰ Πλάτῳ καὶ ὁ Λάμπων παρὰ Κρατίνῳ καὶ τῶν κωμωδουμένων ἕκαστος· ὥστε γραμματοδιδασκαλεῖον ἡμῖν γενέσθαι τὸ συμπόσιον ἢ κωφὰ καὶ ἄσημα τὰ σκώμματα διαφέρεσθαι.

² J. Steinhausen, *Κωμωδούμενοι*, D. Bonn 1910.

2. ATHENAEVS 591 C.

(Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἑταιρῶν δύο ἀναγράφει Φρόνας γε-
γονέναι, ὧν τὴν μὲν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι Κλαυσιγέλωτα, τὴν δὲ Σαπέρ-
διον.) Ἡρόδικος δὲ ἐν ζ' Κωμωδουμένων τὴν μὲν παρὰ τοῖς
ῥήτορσιν φησιν ὀνομαζομένην Σηστὸν καλεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ἀποσῆθαι
καὶ ἀποδύειν τοὺς συνόντας αὐτῇ, τὴν δὲ Θεσπικὴν.

4 Σῆστρον non recte Madvig; composuerat Herodicus Phrynen, quae et Sestos, cum Sinopa, quae et Abydos uocatur.

3. ATHENAEVS 234 D. (Similiter Suidas s. v.)

(Πολέμων) ἐπεκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Στηλοκόπας,¹ ὥς Ἡρόδικος ὁ
Κρατήτειος εἴρηκε.

As Steinhausen conjectured, the sixth book contained a list of the hetaeras, and probably the whole stock in Athenaeus from ch. XIII 50 p. 586 onwards is a compilation based on the work of Herodicus.

The *schol. in Vespr.* 1239 refers to Ἀρμόδιος ἐν τοῖς Κωμωδουμένοις, and since the conjecture of Dobree it has been supposed that we ought to read Ἡρόδικος. Susemihl preferred to read Ἀμμώνιος, and Steinhausen shows that this is the only possible solution.

There are two small fragments from another work of Herodicus, the Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα.

4. ATHENAEVS 340 E.

Ἡρόδικος δ' ὁ Κρατήτειος ἐν τοῖς Συμμίκτοις ὑπομνήμασι τοῦ
Καλλιμέδοντος νύδον ὄντα ἀπέδειξε τὸν Ἀγύρριον.

Cfr Ath. 100 D, 104 D, 339 F, 614 D.

5. SCHOL. in RAN. 1028 *de Aeschyli Persis*.

Ἡρόδικος δὲ φησι διττὰς γεγενῆσθαι τὰς καθέσεις καὶ τὴν τραγω-
δίαν ταύτην περιέχειν τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην.²

¹ He made extensive journeys through Greece, in order to collect materials for his geographical works, in the course of which he paid particular attention to the inscriptions on votive offerings and on columns, whence he obtained the surname of Στηλοκόπας. Smith's *Dictionary* III, 434.

² This passage is discussed by J. Schönemann, *Herodicea*, Rh. Mus. 42 (1887) p. 467.

Callimedon, surnamed *ὁ Κάραβος*, was an Athenian orator belonging to the Macedonian party, who took great part in the internal troubles before and after the death of Alexander the Great. He was ridiculed by several authors of comedy, as the passages quoted from Athenaeus show. Probably Herodicus dealt with him in his work *Κωμωδούμενοι*. Köpke¹ suggests that this passage too belonged to the latter work, indeed he thinks that Herodicus wrote one work only and that this work was referred to under different titles. This does not seem very probable, though. The literary genre of *ὑπομνήματα σύμμικτα* begins to be increasingly common during this period and this is easily understood, if we consider the conditions of the time. The *βιβλιακοὶ χαρακῖται*² of those days could not abstain from publishing the results of their various studies of the treasures of the libraries. Even the title indicates that the author did not limit himself to a certain subject-matter or theme. Such a work would contain sundry remarks and observations on nearly everything including various excerpts. If the author confined himself to a certain group of subjects, he used to entitle his work *ὑπομνήματα ἱστορικά, τακτικά, θεατρικά, συμποτικά* and so on.

It is therefore not impossible that the treatise *Περὶ συμποσίων* and, who knows, perhaps also the the essay *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσοφικὴν* were parts of the compilation *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα*. But the *Κωμωδοῦμενοι* was a separate work in at least six books.

One of the fragments above gives us a new landmark as to the time of Herodicus. The Stoic philosopher Polemo was a contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium and a disciple of Panaetius. Perhaps he was one of the *Παναιτιασταί*, mentioned 186 A and discussed above p. 93.

There are three fragments in the scholia to Homer which bear the name of Herodicus.

¹ E. Köpke, *De hypomnematis Graecis*, P. Berlin 1842, p. 6.

² Polybius derides these book-learned men XII 25 e *ἐνιοὶ τῶν δοκούντων ἐδλόγως προσάγειν πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν, καθάπερ οἱ λογικοὶ* (theoreticians) *τῶν ἱατρῶν, ἐνδιατρίψαντες ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις καὶ καθόλου τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων περιποιησάμενοι πολυπειρίαν πείθουσιν αὐτοὺς ὥς ὄντες ἱκανοὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιβουλήν*. And 25 g: *οἱ βιβλιακοὶ* cannot write *ἐμπείρως* or *ἐνφαντικῶς*. And 27: it is easy now to write books, if you go to a city *ἔχουσαν ὑπομνημάτων πλῆθος ἢ βιβλιοθήκην πον γειτνίωσαν*.

6. SCHOL. VEN. **A** in *N* 29 γηθοσύνη] Ἡρόδικος τὴν ὅς συλλαβὴν ὀξύνει, ἵνα ᾗ τὸ πλήρες γηθόσυνα, εἴτα ἡ δὲ θάλασσα, ὃ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος γηθόσυνη δὲ θάλασσα ἀντὶ τοῦ γηθόσυνος, χαίρουσα.¹

Thus Herodicus read:

οὐδ' ἠγνοίησαν ἄνακτα
γηθόσυν', ἡ δὲ θάλασσα δίστατο.

The Townleiana are more explicit:

γηθοσύνη] Ἀρίσταρχος ὁρθὴν αὐτὴν φησιν, ὥς ψάμμωκυανέη (*Od.* μ 243), ὃ μέντοι Ἡρωδιανὸς διὰ πολλῶν αὐτὴν δοτικὴν ἀποδείκνυσιν, οἱ δὲ γηθόσυνα τὰ κήτη <εἴτα ἡ δέ>.

Aristarch thus preferred the nominative of the adjective, although the adjectives in -συνος as a rule have no feminine form. Herodianus and Aristophanes preferred the dative, and to me this seems to be the correct reading, if we compare *Φ* 390 ἐγέλασσε δέ οἱ φίλον ἦτορ γηθοσύνη. Here we have the old use of the instrumentalis in a modal, not causal sense.

The reading of Herodicus (οἱ δέ) is a typical product of Pergamene interpretation of Homer. Probably he has started from the fact that there are practically no passages in the *Iliad* besides perhaps *T* 362 γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθών, in which a natural phenomenon is depicted as accompanied by emotional sentiments.

Modern editors nearly all follow Aristarch. But it should be observed that Aristarch has probably introduced his reading in consequence of his leading principle, the analogy,² and the scholia tell us that Aristophanes read γηθοσύνη. This is probably the oldest and in any case the soundest reading. The climax is beautiful; even the sea opens in joy and makes way for the Lord of the Seas.

7. SCHOL. VEN. **A** in *Y* 53 θεῶν] Ἡρόδικος βαρέως ἀνεγίνωσκεν ὡς τρέχων, μετοχὴν ποιῶν, ὃ μέντοι Ἀρίσταρχος περιέσπα.

Herodicus thus read:

(Ἀρης) ἄλλοτε παρ Σιμόεντι θεῶν ἐπὶ Καλλικολώνη.

¹ The passage is discussed by Ameis-Hentze in their *Anhang zu Homers Ilias* and by J. La Roche, *Die homerische Textkritik im Altertum*, Leipzig 1866, p. 218.

² Compare *Δ* 272, 326, *Σ* 557, *H* 122, *N* 82.

and this is also the reading of all modern editions. Of course it is not kind to deprive Herodicus of the honour of this reading, the only one possible, but I cannot suppress the suggestion that 'Ηρόδικος is here a misinterpretation of 'Ηρωδιανός.

8. SCHOL. TOWNL. in X 385 ἄλλως: ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα] οἱ περὶ 'Ηρόδικόν φασι προφασίζεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸν περὶ τὰς Σκαιᾶς πόλεμον.

Modern editors read either τί ἦ or τί ἤ, compare A 407, but according to good ancient tradition, not only Herodianus, one ought to prefer τί ἤ. There is evidence¹ for the fact that Crates occupied himself with this question too, namely in the *schol.* δ 260, where the scholiast observes that Aristarch read ἐπεὶ ἤδη while Crates read ἐπεὶ ἦ δῆ.

The reading τίη — if it was really defended by Herodicus, which is by no means proved by the wording of the scholium — is obviously a pure mistake. La Roche has shown, how Eustathius misinterpreted his sources, the unknown grammarians Apion and Herodorus. If this Apion were identical with Apion Pleistonices, a relation to the Crateteian school could be established, for Pleistonices really took over much material from the Pergamene exegesis of Homer. But it is hard to believe that this obscure Apion of Eustathius really was identical with the famous Apion Pleistonices, the *cymbalum mundi*.

As to the explanation προφασίζεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸν περὶ τὰς Σκαιᾶς πόλεμον, this too seems to me to be a typical product of the Pergamene exegesis with its trend to implicate concealed, often mystic allusions in the text. Apparently Herodicus suggests that Achilles suddenly came to think of Hector's words ἡματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσιν, and hence abstained from attacking Troy afresh. Yet it is much more natural to explain the passage thus: immediately after the triumphant victory over Hector, Achilles is at first eager to make a violent assault on Troy, but — and this is a good example of the fine psychological art of Homer — he has hardly begun to fire the

¹ The evidence is collected by La Roche *op. cit.* p. 267. Herodianus in Y 251 περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἦ τοῦ ὑποτασσομένου τῷ τ ἰ καὶ τῷ ἐ π ε ἰ ἐδηλώσαμεν ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων, ὥς τῷ τ ἰ ὑποτασσομένου μὲν ἐγκλίνεται, τῷ δὲ ἐ π ε ἰ περισπᾶται. Thus the correct reading is τί ἤ and ἐπεὶ ἦ.

Argives with his speech, ere he suddenly cuts off: this is not my affair. In this moment his thoughts wander to his beloved Patroclus, and he returns to his tent.

In my opinion thus the interpretation of Herodicus is decidedly wrong.

9. HERACLITI QUAEST. HOMER. 11 (p. 18 Oelmann).

Σφόδρα γοῦν πιθανῶς Ἡρόδικος ἀποφαίνεται μὴδ' ὅλην τὴν δεκαετίαν ἐν Ἰλίῳ μεμενηκέναι τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ καθειμαρμένον χρόνου τῆς ἀλώσεως ἐληλυθέναι. καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἄλογον εἰδότας ἐξ ὧν προεῖπεν ὁ Κάλχας, ὅτι τῷ δεκάτῳ πόλιν αἰρήσουσιν εὐρύαντιαν (B 329), ἐπ' οὐδενὶ χρησίμῳ τοσοῦτων ἐτῶν ἀργίαν ἀναλίσκειν, ἀλλ' εἰκὸς ἐν τοῖς μεταξὺ καιροῖς περιπλέοντας ἄνω καὶ κάτω τὴν Ἀσίαν ἅμα τὰς τε πολεμιστηρίους ἀσκήσεις ὑπογυμνάζειν καὶ λαφύρων τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐμπιμπλάναι, τοῦ δεκάτου δ' ἐνστάτος ἔτους, ἐν ᾧ πεπωμένον ἦν τὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως τέλος, ἀθρόους καταχθῆναι. κοῖλα δ' αὐτοὺς τενάγη καὶ τόπος ἐλώδης ἐξεδέχετο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θέρονος ἐνστάτος ἡ λοιμικὴ νόσος ἐγκατέσκηψε.

This rationalism, somehow akin to Euhemeristic interpretation, is another side of the Pergamene exegesis of Homer, of which Helck in his studies on Crates offers so many good examples. *Audebant Aristarchei ignorare, cum Crates omnia se posse critica ratione sua investigare male censeret* — with this observation Helck hit the nail on the head.¹ The suggestion that the Greeks, in expectation of the fulfilment of Calchas' prophecy, carried on *πολεμιστηρίους ἀσκήσεις*, is in fact amusing. It is not easy to take this kind of interpretation seriously. But in view of the manner in which Herodicus deals with Plato, we must acknowledge that it is quite sincerely meant.

It cannot be decided if Herodicus wrote a commentary on Homer, as is suggested by Jonsius, Wolf and others, but it is very improbable. It is more likely that he wrote sundry observations on Homer in his *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα*. If we dare hazard the conclusion that his observations on Homer together with his anti-platonic elaborations *Περὶ συμποσίων* and *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην* were collected in the *Σύμμικτα ὑπομνήματα*, and that somehow Heraclitus, the author

¹ *De Cratetis studiis criticis quae ad Odysseam spectant*, P. Dresden 1914, p. 33.

of the *Ὅμηρικὰ προβλήματα*, hit upon this book, the strong anti-platonic tendency of this latter writing would be appropriately explained.

The method of interpretation adopted by Herodicus in the fragments 8 and 9, is certainly developed from the methods of Crates, but the intellectual level of the latter was of course quite another than that of his disciple. There is still an inclination nowadays — in spite of the work done by various scholars — to regard Crates as inferior to Aristarch, but this is not justified. There is not much left of his work on the exegesis on Homer, but it is enough to let us understand that, in spite of his many aberrations, he was an ingenious interpreter with a vast knowledge of literature. As I have pointed out before, Herodicus stands to him as Chamaeleon to Aristotle.

V. THE ANTI-PLATONIC TRADITION

Introduction Ancient Greece was a small country. This is especially apparent when we turn our eyes from all the great and beautiful works of art to the men of narrow mind who formed a not inconsiderable part of the population. In the Grove of Academus and in the Garden of Epicurus flourished not only the fair flowers of philosophy: the rank weeds of meanness found a fertile soil there also. Greek literature bears, in point of fact, the impress of personal polemic. We find controversial discussion in the high-tuned poetry of Pindar, in the plays of Euripides, and in the comedies of Aristophanes, written for the general public, a personal polemic overflowing all bounds. We find abundant sarcasms and the stings of personal satire in the works of Plato, and even the cool and unemotional lectures of an Aristotle are at intervals spiced with cutting and snappish retorts to some personal antagonist or other. In the earliest specimens of biographical literature — the portraits of statesmen and commanders in Thucydides, Plato and Xenophon — we find, further, tendentious panegyric but also spiteful caricatures. And throughout the whole antiquity this kind of literature bears the same stamp: everything seems to be allowed save the writing of an objective estimate of the person in question. One creates *χαρακτῆρες*, ethical characters (Theophrastus and the New comedy), another concentrates on certain, in themselves unimportant details (so Neanthes diligently describes the manner in which great men met their death, others wrote books on longlived men), or else there is a bias in a certain direction as in Plutarch, for example, who stresses the educative side. Another again is at pains to glorify one person at the expense of somebody else. This is especially true of the polemic between the schools of philosophy, where all the powers of the imagination were brought into play in order to portray the virtues and moral superiority of the scholars favoured by the writer himself,

who loses no opportunity in scoring off the coryphaeuses of the enemy camp.¹

The *διαβολή* was quite conscious. Lucian vividly describes a picture by Apelles,² who had painted *Διαβολή* surrounded by *Ἀγνοια* and *Ὑπόληρις*. She holds in one hand a flaming torch, with the other hand she drags a young man along by the hair; he raises his hands in protest to heaven that he is innocent. A pale hollow-eyed man aids in dragging him along, namely *Φθόνος*. Two other women urge them on, *Ἐπιβουλή* and *Ἀπάτη*. A woman in deep mourning *Μετάνοια*, glances appealingly towards *Ἀλήθεια*, who is dimly visible in the background.

The biographical literature often gives indication of traits that are typical of the Greek psyche. *Profecturus es ad homines maxime homines* said a noble Roman to the young student who was leaving for Athens. Man is the central thing in art, literature and Greek thought in general. With the problem of Man Greek art struggles from the imperfect attempts of the Geometric Period down to Laocoon. Man and his *ἀρετή* is the nuclear problem of Greek philosophy from *ἐδιζησάμην ἐμεινοντόν* via Socrates to Marcus Aurelius. No Greek poet, save perhaps Sappho, writes just pouring out his heart; he writes for a certain group of fellow citizens or partisans, and it is this, as a rule, that gives his diction its characteristic note. The biographical literature too always aimed at pleasing a certain public, the adherents in particular of the writer's own party or school of thought.

The anti-platonic tradition is a notion of very great amplitude and it is not the object of this study to deal with this vast subject in any great detail, though it would be a rewarding theme for a more comprehensive study in the future. I shall confine myself here to an attempt to visualize the conception and give a general account of the anti-platonic tendencies with quotations from extant literature.

¹ Cic. *De fin.* II 25 *sit ista in Graecorum levitate perversitas, qui maledictis insectantur eos a quibus de veritate dissentiunt*, cfr *De oratore* I 11. Compare Plutarch's acid censure of all obtretractores Platonis, *de sollertia animalium* IV 3, p. 962 B and *de inimicorum utilitate* 10, p. 91 F, *πᾶσα φύσις ἀνθρώπου φέρει φιλονεικίαν καὶ ζηλοτυπίαν* κτλ.

² *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥαδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῇ* 5.

A chronological enumeration of all those who, in one respect or another, criticized Plato's person, his philosophy, the Academy, or his closest followers, certainly has its value, but something more is needed in this connection. We possess such an enumerative survey in Fenk's dissertation¹, where the opponents of Plato have been grouped under the headings *comici*, *adversarii politici*, *rhetoires* and *philosophi*. Fenk has, however, not attempted to gradate his outline; if there is a quotation preserved, furnishing some sort of criticism against Plato, the author is immediately classed as an *obtrectator Platonis*. Nor has Fenk endeavoured to form any estimate of what the criticism of Plato aimed at during different periods, whether it represented an attack on Plato personally, his political activity, or on certain details in his philosophy or diction and the composition of his dialogues etc. In my opinion this aspect is the most fruitful, and my task in this study will be to locate the anti-platonic writings and activities of Herodicus and to assess their context and significance.

We had first better examine the implication of the term »the anti-platonic tradition«. We understand thereby all deliberate criticism of Plato and his school, whether levelled at Plato himself in person, his mode of life and conduct, his disciples and followers, or the Academy as such; further we take the term to cover criticism of the political activities originating from the Academy, of the Platonic philosophy, and finally criticism of the language and style and the myths in the Platonic dialogues.

As *obtrectatores Platonis*, however, in the proper sense of the word, we cannot of course regard all those who in any of these respects have expressed themselves in critical terms on the subject of Plato. Above all we cannot classify those who in the philosophical debate proper have adopted a standpoint different from that of Plato and his school, as *obtrectatores*. Only those who, like our Herodicus, have indulged in personal invective against Plato or by deliberate misinterpretation of his utterances, actions and writings have sought to defame him, can be included in this category. These *obtrectatores* are known to us mainly through random utterances accidentally preserved or by the fact that the titles of their works, otherwise

¹ R. Fenk, *Adversarii Platonis quomodo de indole ac moribus eius iudicaverint*. D. Jena 1913.

lost, are still known. It is only from the writings of Herodicus that enough has survived to afford us an idea of the nature and aspect of this kind of literature.

Some words on the sources of the biographical allegations may suitably be inserted here. The tradition is indeed very complicated, as a rule, in the case of these biographical details. Thanks to the custom of the Alexandrian biographers¹, who were very careful about mentioning their sources, we are able to see the process by which an in itself rather inconspicuous statement has reached us. Let us take as an example Diogenes Laertius V 41 writing about Theophrastus. *Φαβωρίνός φησι γηράσαντα αὐτὸν περιφέρεισθαι καὶ τοῦτο λέγειν "Ερμιππον παρατιθέμενον ἱστορεῖν Ἀρκεσίλαον.* Arcesilaus heard Theophrastus in the latter's old age. Probably he told this story to Hermippus, who as a matter of fact often appeals to oral tradition, or else perhaps Hermippus read it in some lost memoir of Arcesilaus. Hermippus, the chief representative of the Alexandrian school of biography, made a point of collecting such pieces of information for his great work *Bíoi* and as a rule quotes the source. Whether Phavorinus received his information direct from Hermippus or not, is of secondary importance and of course impossible to say, because the *Bíoi* is the main source for all later information on the subject of philosophers, rhetors and poets. And where Diogenes has excerpted Phavorinus we can only guess. But the names of these intermediate sources are generally of small importance, if we know the primary source.

The first leading principle in forming an estimate of biographical data is this: we must trace the primary source. The tradition consists of a long series of allegations, handed down from author to author. In the Alexandrian literature the intermediary links were frequently specified; in the belletristic literature, as in Plutarch, and in most second-class authors, this was not so commonly done, from different motives. If the primary source is traced, it is usually possible to draw certain conclusions as to the tendency and trustworthiness.

¹ F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form.* Leipzig 1901.

The second leading principle is just this: to test the tendency of the work and its trustworthiness. We have seen what happens to truth in the case of Herodicus.¹ Unfortunately the same is true of nearly the whole biographical literature. For this reason it is most necessary to try to penetrate to the origin of the data quoted or the ultimate source. Then at least we have some chance of stating the degree of trustworthiness in the statement in question.

The oldest representative of the afterwards extremely popular type of literature known as peripatetic biography, is Chamaeleon. He is of the school of Aristotle and has learnt how to reel off biographical details by way of interpreting texts. We have still an exquisite example of the Aristotelean art of interpretation in the commentary on the poems of Solon in the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*. Chamaeleon is, as we can see from the fragments of his writings preserved², still quite harmless, even if by rash combination his portraits assume the nature of arbitrary fancies.

Aristoxenus is the first great calumniator. There is not much left of his biographical writings, but the numerous fragments of his *Life of Socrates* show us clearly what he aimed at. Seething with hatred and malignity, he collected every derogatory piece of information he could get hold of, and by this means created a tradition which was to have unfortunate consequences in the future.³ Aristoxenus paved the way for the other peripatetics, and he has a long line of worthy followers in Neanthes of Cyzicus (c. 270 B. C.), in Ariston

¹ Many a modern scholar who has taken a statement of an author like Herodicus for granted, has done much work in vain. An example among many others is G. Teichmüller, who in his comprehensive study *Literarische Fehden im vierten Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, I—II, Breslau 1881—1884, without the slightest reservation accepts Athenaeus, i. e. Herodicus, as a good and trustworthy source of information.

² E. Köpke, *De Chamaeleonte Peripatetico*, P. Berlin 1856. I hope to be able to publish a separate study on Chamaeleon, of whom we have more fragments in Athenaeus and in the scholia, in the near future.

³ Aristoxenus is judged very differently: by Mahne (*Diatribae de Aristoxeno*, Amsterdam 1793) favourably, by Luzac (*Lectiones Atticae*, Leyden 1809) quite unfavourably, by Westphal (*Aristoxenus*, Leipzig 1883, and other writings) most favourably, by v. Meiss (*Rhein. Mus.* 71 (1916) rehabilitatingly, by Stuart (*Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, Berkeley 1928) with sensible balance. In the following I revert to the subject.

of Ceos, and Bion of Borysthenes (c. 250 B. C.) and others, in whom the taste for witty stories far exceeds the love of truth. At about the same time Hieronymus of Rhodes and Idomeneus were writing their chroniques scandaleuses, and the anonymous treatise on the *τροφή τῶν παλαιῶν* is also from this time. With Hermippus (c. 225 B. C.) comes a man who makes it his business to work up this type of literature in a scientific way, and he is the more dangerous in that the counterfeiting is now practised systematically. His great work was used by all succeeding biographers and story-tellers. His contemporary Antigonius of Carystus is an exception; he wrote a literary work of quite different nature, dealing with philosophers who had not been previously portrayed. His work was therefore original and of great value to all his successors. With Satyrus (c. 200) the biographical tradition undergoes a certain purification and the worst features are excised. The numerous compilations of the second century are consequently a somewhat more temperate and reasonable in tone. More than was the case previously, chronological views consonant with the historico-philosophical outlook in the proper sense of the word are adopted. This is true especially of Sotion (c. 170 B. C.) and Heraclides Lembus (c. 150 B. C.). The *Ἐπιτομή* of Heraclides was epoch-making. In a very judicious and ingenious way he seems to have worked up the whole previous tradition, founding his work on Hermippus, Antigonius, Satyrus and Sotion, whose statements he has examined and sifted. The result must have been a work of considerable scientific value, the loss of which is deeply to be regretted.

With Heraclides the biographical literature reaches its zenith. Howbeit, the calumniatory literature of the old school still flourishes. Heraclides is a contemporary of Aristarchus and probably his match in respect of learning and sound judgment in his special field. Consequently he is, too, a contemporary of Herodicus.

After this preamble I shall try to rehearse the anti-platonic tra- *The Comedy*
dition, grouping the authors according to their aim and tendency, keeping in the main to the chronological order.

The old and middle comedy of course dealt much with the philosophers. And in regard to Plato it is interesting to observe that we have quite a number of fragments, showing that the criticism

comprised exactly the four points I have previously mentioned, viz. his person, political activity, philosophy and points in regard to his language. Now there is very little that has survived from these comedies, but we know that they have constituted a storehouse for the peripatetic biographers¹. I only refer by the way to the well-known word of Chamaeleon *παρὰ δὲ τοῖς κωμικοῖς ἢ περὶ τῶν τραγικῶν ἀπόκειται πίστις*. The comedy was used systematically as a source of information by the two contemporaries Herodicus of Pergamon and Ammonius of Alexandria, who both wrote lexica of *κωμωδούμενοι*. From these compilations the data found their way generally into later literature, and from Diogenes Laertius we can see how rich the material was: III 26 *ὁμῶς ἐσκόφθη καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τῶν κωμικῶν. Θεόπομπος γοῦν ἐν Ἡδυχάρει φησὶν οὕτως* (I 737 K.) *ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἐν Θησεῖ* (II 142), *Ἀλεξὺς Μεροπίδι* (II 351) *καὶ ἐν Ἀγκυλίῳ* (II 297), *Ἄμφις Ἀμφικράτει* (II 237), *ἐν δὲ Δεξιδημίδῃ* (II 239), *Κρατῖνος Ψευδυποβολιμαίῳ* (II 292), *Ἀλεξὺς Ὀλυμπιοδώρῳ* (II 355) *καὶ ἐν Παρασίτῳ* (II 364), *χλευάζει δ' αὐτὸν καὶ Ἀναξίλας ἐν Βοτρυλίῳ καὶ Κίρκῃ καὶ Πλουσίαις*². Thus there are 12 quotations about Plato alone. Some of them we know from other sources also, e. g. through Hesychius Milesius, and Fenk has collected and discussed them in his second chapter. I quote some of them below.

In the fragments preserved the criticism chiefly concerns the portly bearing and somewhat strange manners of Plato and the Academics. In spite of the fact that Plato was a thorough-bred Athenian, the people of Athens seem to have regarded the philosophers of the Academy as strangers. And in fact all the prominent members, save the master himself and his nephew Speusippus, were strangers from different places, often from far-off countries³. Xenocrates too, like Plato himself⁴, was regarded as *σεμνός* and *σκηθρωπός*, and Heraclides of Pontus was named *Πομπικός* by the witty Athenians. Aristotle was mocked at because of the elegance of his clothes, and his rings and well-dressed hair also came in for comment. In

¹ See J. Steinhausen, *Κωμωδούμενοι*, D. Bonn 1910, p. 67 with the literature.

² Steinhausen p. 69 remarks with right that the quotation from Timon is added by Diogenes.

³ Antiphanes' *Antaeus* fr. 33, Ath. 545 A, and the eclogue of Ephippus quoted by Herodicus.

⁴ Diog. Laert. III 26, IV 6.

preserved fragments and the allusions to lost comedies there are, however, — and this is a remarkable fact — no derogatory or contemptuous insinuations about Plato's person apart from the harmless mockery on the subject of this *σεμνότης*¹. Not even the banquets of the Academic *θιασῶται* were derided in the usual manner. The philosophers partook of regular meals together, and skits on the surfeit and gluttony which marked these festivals were very popular. Of Plato, however, the only thing that could be said was ὁ Πλάτων, εὖ δειπνεῖτε μᾶλλον εἰς τὴν ὑστεραίαν ἢ τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν². The common view in Athens probably corresponded to the proverb of unknown date Ἀκαδημίῃθεν ἦκεις· ἦτοι σοφὸς καὶ σπουδαῖος ὑπάρχεις³. There was, on the other hand, all the more to be said about some of the men who belonged to the circle of Socrates and those who figured in the Platonic dialogues or were mentioned there, or later on were members of the Academy. The lexica of *κωμωδοῦμενοι* of Herodicus and Ammonius were freely used by later writers; Plutarch, for instance, has obviously utilized them diligently⁴.

Plato apparently advocated a diet of vegetable food and moreover a very frugal one. There are several allusions to this in the comedy⁵, and probably the *Ἡδυχάρης* by Theopompus dealt mainly with this theme. I quote a fragment from Ath. 308 A:

καὶ στήτ' ἐφεξῆς, κεστρέων νῆσις χορός,
λαχάνοισιν, ὥσπερ χῆνες, ἐξενισμένοι.

Κεστρέύς, the mullet, is a proverbial nickname of a starveling, since its stomach was found empty. *Hedychares* is perhaps a nickname for Plato himself: it is an old trick to contrast name and manners with one another.

The philosophy of Plato in the proper sense of the word was of course not assailed by the comic writers, but some of the leading ideas were well-known to the public and the points of attack in the contemporary comedy are noteworthy. First and foremost philo-

¹ *Amphis* in *Dexidemides* fr. 13: ὁ Πλάτων, ὡς οὐδὲν οἶσθα πλὴν σκυθρωπάζειν μόνον ὥσπερ κοχλίας σεμνῶς ἐπηρκῶς τὰς ὀφρῦς.

² Hegesander *ap. Ath.* 419 C, compare 137 F.

³ *Paroemiogr. Gr.* II p. 265.

⁴ See Steinhausen p. 72 and Wilamowitz *Aristoteles u. Athen* I 263.

⁵ See Anaxandrides, *Diog. L.* III 26, cfr VI 25, further Phanocritus *ap. Ath.* 276 F.

sophical studies in general were ridiculed, and arguments were used which are still current among the public at large. Of Aristophon's drama *Plato* there is a fragment preserved¹:

- A. ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν
ἰσχνότερον αὐτὸν ἀποφανῶ Φιλίππιδου.
B. οὕτως ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις νεκροὺς ποιεῖς;

and likewise by Alexis in the *Meropis* II 351 K:

- εἰς καιρὸν ἤκεις ὥς ἔγωγ' ἀπορουμένη
ἄνω κάτω τε περιπατοῦσ' ὥσπερ Πλάτων
σοφὸν οὐδὲν εὔρηκ', ἀλλὰ κοπιῶ τὰ σκέλη.

An echo of the great questions and problems discussed within the Academy reaches us in some fragments. Plato's opinions on the immortality of the soul were not so readily understood by his contemporaries as we are perhaps sometimes prone to believe. Anyhow it was felt that new and sensational ideas had been generated. I quote the fragment of the younger Cratinus II 292 K.:

- A. ἄνθρωπος εἰ δηλονότι καὶ ψυχὴν ἔχεις;
B. κατὰ μὲν Πλάτων' οὐκ οἶδ', ὑπονοῶ δ' ὥδ' ἔχειν.

and Alexis in the *Olympiodorus* II 355 K.:

- A. σῶμα μὲν ἐμοῦ τὸ θνητὸν αἶον ἐγένετο,
τὸ δ' ἀθάνατον ἐξῆρε πρὸς τὸν ἄερα.
B. ταῦτ' οὐ σχολή Πλάτωνος;

Another echo of the discussion in the *Phaedo* 96 E reaches us in the *Hedychares* of Theopompus, mentioned above, I 737 K.

- ἐν γὰρ ἔστιν οὐδὲ ἐν,
τὰ δὲ δύο μόλις ἐν ἔστιν, ὥς φησιν Πλάτων.

Similarly the discussion on the True Being in the *Parmenides* is caricatured in an incredibly skillfully composed eclogue from the Cleophanes by Antiphanes, by far the most ingenious of the comic writers of the middle comedy².

¹ Kock II 279 gives the parallels and Fenk discusses these passages in the dissertation referred to above (p. 134).

² See Kock's edition and Fenk's discussion p. 29.

Hussey¹ thought that there are allusions to the first four books of the *Republic* in the *Στρατιώτιδες* of Theopompus. He takes the hesitating utterances made by Socrates in the fifth book as evidence of his fear of the attacks of the comic authors. This would mean that 'Theopompus' play was presented just before Plato wrote the fifth book of the *Republic*. As far as I can see, however, Hussey's theory will not hold water. Anyway the fragments are too meagre.

The Platonic *Ἔρως* is burlesqued in the *Φαῖδρος* of Alexis,² and perhaps there is an allusion to the same theme in the *Ἑλένη* II 320 K.

Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν is represented in the *Πύρρος* of Philemon, an author of the new comedy, II 496 K. and in the *Ἀμφικράτης* by Amphis II 237 K.,

- A. τὸ δ' ἀγαθὸν ὃ τι ποτ' ἐστίν, οὗ σὺ τυγχάνειν
μέλλεις διὰ ταύτην, ἥτιον οἶδα τοῦτ' ἐγώ,
ὦ δέσποτ', ἢ τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν. B. πρόσσεχε δῆ.

and Alexis in the *Μίκκων* II 353 K. says

- A. κἄν μὴ παραθῶσι θερμά· B. τἀγαθὸν Πλάτων
ἀπανταχοῦ φησ' ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, μανθάνεις;
τὸ θ' ἥδὲ πάντως ἥδύ, κἀκεῖ κἀνθάδε.

Later on in the new comedy we find a typical distortion of the theme in Philippides' *Ἀνανέουσα* II 303 K, discussed by Fenk p. 46.

- A. ἔλεγον ἐγώ σοι μὴ γαμεῖν, ζῆν δ' ἡδέως.
B. τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθὸν δ' ἐστὶ τοῦτο, Φειδύλε,
μὴ λαμβάνειν γυναῖκα.

In the famous fragment by Epicrates II 287 K., so often quoted, we get the most detailed caricature of the lectures and discussions in the Academy, especially of the endless hairsplittings³. The enthusiasm for classification is derided also by Alexis in the *Ἀγκυλίων*, II 297 K. and in *adesp. novae* 149, III 438 K.

¹ I 747 Kock, see G. B. Hussey, *On Plato and the Attic Comedy*, Class. Studies in honour of H. Drisler, New York 1894, p. 84.

² II 386 Kock.

³ W. Jaeger, *Aristotle*, Oxford 1934 p. 18, Fenk op. cit. p. 32. The scientific equivalent to the fragment of Epicrates is the criticism of *διχοτομία* in the *Parts of Animals*.

These faint echoes of the discussions in the Academy and of the writings of Plato can, if anything, be compared to the manner in which the daily press of our own time serves up reports on similar matters¹ and must be judged accordingly. They are by no means dictated by ill-will, rather by inquisitive interest and the desire to be up-to-date, coupled with solid ignorance.

The political activity of Plato is not referred to in any fragment of comedy that has come down to us, a fact which it is easy to explain. Political persiflage is characteristic of the old comedy. On the other hand, it is obvious, as Meineke has shown, that Plato's language has been caricatured in the fragment of Epicrates, and it is a question whether the repeated *πάνν μὲν οὖν* and *κομιδῇ μὲν οὖν*² in the *Plutus* is not a parody of Plato's language, possibly also the fragment, wrongly ascribed to Epicharmus, n. 171 Kaibel, beginning

A. ἄρ' ἔστιν ἀλλησίς τι πρᾶγμα; B. πάνν μὲν οὖν.

This fragment is probably a product of Alcimus³ himself, a younger contemporary of Plato, and was inserted *ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Ἀμύνταν*. In my opinion it belongs to the same class of parodies as the other ones from the middle comedy.

The Isocratean censure of Plato's style and of the literary form of the dialogues is a consequence of Plato's corresponding criticism of the rhetoricians. For the Isocratean conception of the importance of style, see e. g. *Philipp.* 24—29; the counterview we find in Plato, *Leg.* 627 D οὐ γὰρ εὐσχημοσύνης τε καὶ ἀσχημοσύνης ῥημάτων ἕνεκα τὰ νῦν σκοπούμεθα πρὸς τὸν τῶν πολλῶν λόγον, but this was in his old age. Plato's censure of the rhetors culminates in his attack on Lysias, of which Dionysius says, *Ep. ad Cn. Pomp.* 754—755: *Βουλευθεὶς γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ* (sc. Plato) *ἐπιδείξασθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν, ἣν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς λόγοις, οὐκ ἠρέεσθαι ταῖς ἄλλαις γραφαῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ κράτιστον τῶν τότε ῥητόρων ἕτερον αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Φαίδρῳ συνετάξατο λόγον, ἔρωτικόν εἰς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν· καὶ οὐδ' ἄχρι τούτου προελθὼν ἐπαύσατο,*

¹ In the *Göteborgs Handels & Sjöfarts Tidning* of February 15, 1941 I read an article — of course written as an amusing causerie — on Plato, which could as well have been written by Herodicus.

² See Denniston, *Particles* p. 477.

³ The alleged great influence of Epicharmus on Plato, a popular topic in later times, is mainly due to the tendentious writings of Alcimus.

καταλιπὼν ἐν τοῖς ἀναγνωσομένοις τὴν διάγνωσιν, ὁπότερός ἐστι κρείττων λόγος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἦπατο τοῦ Λυσίου, τὰς μὲν λεκτικὰς μαρτυρῶν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἀρετάς, τῶν δὲ πραγματικῶν ἐπιλαμβανόμενος. ὁπότε οὖν Πλάτων, τὸ φορτικώτατον καὶ ἐπαχθέστατον τῶν ἔργων προελόμενος, αὐτὸν ἐπαινεῖν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν λόγων, οὐδὲν ᾔετο ποιεῖν κατηγορίας ἄξιον, εἰ παρὰ τὸν ἀριστον τῶν τότε ῥητόρων τοὺς ἰδίους ἐξετάζειν ἡξίου λόγους . . . τί θαυμαστὸν ἐποίουν ἐγὼ τοῖς Δημοσθένους λόγοις συγκρίνων τοὺς Πλάτωνος;

It seems likely that the source of Dionysius was Dicaearchus, who in his *Lives of Philosophers* had dealt with Plato's style. We have now only the oft-quoted judgment on the style of the *Phaedrus* left. It is also probable that the characteristic of Plato's style in *De compos. verb.* 243 and particularly the story about the *Republic* added there, comes from Dicaearchus. Of course we shall guard ourselves against believing that Dicaearchus made a systematic attempt to featurise Plato's style. His work has, however, also left some traces in the pamphlet of Numenius¹ *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀκαδημαϊκῶν πρὸς Πλάτωνα διαστάσεως*. The criticism of Plato in the work of Numenius, which we know chiefly through Eusebius, mainly deals with philosophical questions and cannot be treated here.

We find a still poorer opinion of Plato's style entertained by Caecilius of Cale Acte, an older contemporary and friend of Dionysius. Caecilius was the most prominent representative of aesthetic classicism and had a great authority on questions of style. The author of *Περὶ ἔκφρου* ch. 32 tells us of him: *φιλῶν γὰρ τὸν Λυσίαν ὥς οὐδ' αὐτὸς αὐτόν, ὅμως μᾶλλον μισεῖ τῷ παντὶ Πλάτωνα ἢ Λυσίαν φιλεῖ*. And Josephus *contra Apionem* II 31, 225 says: *ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν Πλάτωνος λόγους τινὲς εἶναι κενοὺς νομίζουσι, κατὰ πολλὴν ἐξουσίαν κεκαλλιγραφημένους*. Yet he seems to aim at the criticism of the laws more than of the style.

I pass over completely the discord between Plato and the other Socratics, especially Antisthenes and the later cynics. The alleged difference between Plato and Xenophon is treated in the commentary to the passage in Herodicus. Of Zoilus, the disciple of Polycrates, we only know that he wrote a pamphlet *Κατὰ Πλάτωνος*, which did

The Isocratians and other contemporaries

¹ See A. E. Leemans, *Numenius von Apamea*, Bryssel 1937, and R. Bentler, *RE Supplb.* VII p. 664.

not become so famous, however, as his attack on Homer. These matters have already been discussed enough by others, though some words must be devoted to Isocrates. After all that has been written¹ on his attitude to Plato, it is clearly impossible to reduce the relations between the two great contemporaries to a simple formula. They seem to have felt esteem for each other in some respects, though at heart they must have been strangers, as their conception of life, their ideas of the ultimate object and methodics of education and their attitude towards rhetoric — a very important matter not only in fourth century Greece — were fundamentally divergent. They must have lacked what Socrates called *κοινὴ βουλή*. The anti-platonic attitude of Isocrates has been most trenchantly formulated in his speech *Περὶ ἀντιδόσεως* 271 from the year 353, which as a whole is instinct with bitterness against the Academy. He says: οὐκ ἔνεστιν ἐν τῇ φύσει τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστήμην λαβεῖν, ἣν ἔχοντες ἂν εἰδεῖμεν οὐτι πρακτέον ἢ λεκτέον εἶστί.² It is in the first place Aristotle who forms the chief target of his criticism. Against him and against the Academy the fight is continued and aggravated by the disciples and followers of Isocrates, his stepson Aphareus³, Cephisodorus and Eubulides⁴, Dioscurides (quoted above p. 81,

¹ See G. Rudberg, *Isokrates und Platon*, Symb. Osl. 2 (1924) p. 1—24 with literature. See further Th. Bergk, *Wann ist Platos Theaetetus abgefasst?* in *Fünf Abhandlungen zur Geschichte d. griech. Philosophie*, Leipzig 1883. Bergk is the most zealous advocate of the view that Plato and Isocrates were bitter enemies. The opposite opinion is vindicated by B. v. Hagen, *Num simultas intercesserit Isocrati cum Platone*, D. Jena 1906. He defends Diog. Laert. III 8. A sound judgment of their different views on education is given by R. L. Howland, *The Attack on Isocrates in the Phaedrus*, Class. Quart. 31 (1937) p. 151—160.

² Compare 261 and 274. See Wilamowitz *Aristoteles u. Athen* I 346.

³ Dionys, *de Isocr.* 18: οὔτε Ἀριστοτέλει πείθομαι ὑπαλίνειν τὸν ἄνδρα βουλομένω, οὔτ' Ἀφαρεῖ τούτου γ' ἕνεκα λόγον εὐπρεπῆ πλαττομένω συντιθεμαι. ἱκανὸν δὲ ἡγησάμενος εἶναι τῆς ἀληθείας βεβαιωτὴν τὸν Ἀθηναῖον Κηφισόδωρον, δς καὶ συνεβλήσεν Ἰσοκράτει καὶ γνησιώτατος ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν ἀπολογίαν τὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τὴν πάνυ θαυμαστὴν ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην ἀντιγραφαῖς ἐποίησατο.

⁴ Themist. *or.* 23, p. 285 C: Πλάτωνος δὲ οὐ μέχρι νῦν καταβοῶσιν ὡς τρεῖς πλεῦσαντος εἰς Σικελίαν ἐπὶ χρήμασι καὶ τραπέζῃ; Κηφισοδώρους δὲ καὶ Εὐβουλίδας καὶ Τιμαίους, Δικαιάρχους (not Δημοχάρους, as has been suggested; apart from the fact that Themistios could hardly know of Demochares, the form is wrong; it would have sounded Δημοχάρας in analogy to τοὺς Σωκράτας) καὶ στρατὸν ὁλον τῶν ἐπιθεμένων Ἀριστοτέλει τῷ Σταγειρίτῃ ποτ' ἂν καταλέξαιμι εὐπετῶς, ὃν καὶ λόγοι ἐξικνοῦνται εἰς τόνδε τὸν χρόνον (c. 370 A. D.) διατηροῦντες τὴν ἀπέχθειαν καὶ

507 D), Theocritus¹, Timotheus², but also by Theopompus, Philiscus, Timaeus, Neanthes and Praxiphanes.

Theopompus was regarded as the most distinguished of the disciples of Isocrates³ and his venomous tongue was so well-known and dreaded that when, at the age of 75, he arrived as a fugitive in Alexandria (c. 305), Ptolemy would have put him to death as a dangerous busybody, had not some of his friends interceded for his life. We know the title of his pamphlet *Criticism of the discourses of Plato*⁴. The Rhetorician Philiscus of Miletus was also an auditor of Isocrates and himself teacher of the historian Timaeus and Neanthes of Cyzicus. The polemic of Timaeus was, like that of Theopompus, personal and bitter⁵ and portions of his calumny of Socrates were still received with delighted approbation by the Holy Fathers⁶. Polybius gives a long survey of all his abusive oratory, aimed at contemporary philosophers and learned men indiscriminately⁷, and also gives us the valuable information that Timaeus was one of the first to use comedy as a source⁸. A good deal of the markedly personal polemic of Timaeus was adopted by Epicurus in his letter *Περὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων*.⁹ That Timaeus also directly attacked Plato is confirmed by

φιλονεικίαν. Compare Dionys. *ep. ad Pomp.* 16, 757 R., see also Solmsen, *N. Philol. Unters.* IV p. 206—7.

¹ A very bitter epigram upon Aristotle is preserved in portions by Diog. Laert. V 11, Plut. *Mor.* 603 C, Euseb. *Praep. evang.* XV 2, p. 793 A, see Jacobs, *Anth. Graec.* I 117 and XIII 958.

² ὁ Κόνωνος, Ath. 419 D, Isocr. *de permul.* 101, is presumably the same as the one whose *Περὶ βίων* is mentioned by Diog. Laert. III 5. He is also mentioned together with Isocrates and Theopompus in the letter from Speusippus, *Ep. Socr.* 30 (28 Köhler), 13.

³ Plut. *Vit. dec. orat.* 837 B, Dionys. *Ep. ad Pomp.* 6, p. 782.

⁴ *Fr. Gr. Hist.* F 259 — Ath. 508 CD with the testimonies, see above p. 82. *Διατριβή* does not signify the school here.

⁵ *Fr.* 70 (Müller I 209) with a stream of coarse words against Aristotle.

⁶ *Fr.* 100 = Cyrillus c. *Julian.* VI, *PGM* LXXXVI, p. 817 BC, cfr *fr.* 113 = Aelianus *Var. hist.* XII 29, 136 = Strabo XIV 640.

⁷ *Fr.* 143 = Polyb. XII 23. Timaeus could never forgive Aristotle for his, in itself correct, description of the birth-town of Timaeus as originally a convict settlement.

⁸ XII 13 *κωμικὸν τινα μάρτυρα προσεπισπασάμενος ἀνώνυμον*, cfr Diog. Laert. VIII 54 *καθὰ καὶ Πλάτων*, Fenk p. 67.

⁹ Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*, p. 174—5.

Plutarch in the introduction to his biography of Nicias. Now Timaeus wrote the main part of his history between 300 and 260 and it is curious to observe how remarkably anti-platonic the literature of this period was. To be sure, the calumny of Aristoxenus and Epicurus has been fatal, but still it is strange to observe how, during a whole generation this hostile sentiment towards philosophy in general and the Academy in particular dominates the whole literature. We have the whole stream of Epicurean pamphlets by Metrodorus, Hermarchus, Colotes and Leontion. During this age Timon wrote his acid *Σίλλοι*. The anonymous¹ treatise *Ἀρίστιππος περὶ παλαιᾶς τρυφῆς*, perhaps the most quoted of all the lucubrations of this time, is another example, further *ὑπομνήματα*, fictitious letters and scribbles by Lynceus, Clearchus of Soli, Duris, Idomeneus, Neanthes. Erotic motifs were cherished especially by Hieronymus of Rhodes and Ariston of Ceos, and the onslaughts on the philosophers even invaded poetry, as can be seen from the fragments of Hermesianax. There are of course exceptions, most notably the historian Philochorus and others, such as the peripatetic Phaenias and Xenocrates, the art-critic.

The animosity between Plato and Isocrates was represented in a queer literary work by Praxiphanes, now unfortunately lost. It is in the form of a dialogue; Plato has invited Isocrates to his country seat and the two men entertain themselves with a conversation on the art of poetry. With this work Praxiphanes introduced a subject later on to be resuscitated as one of the chief arguments against Plato, namely that he was a bad judge of poetry. Still later his attitude towards Homer in particular came into the foreground. The judgments of Praxiphanes were embraced by the literary aesthetic of the Alexandrians and we possess evidence that Callimachus as well as Duris — the latter of course very dependently — took the same side².

Of Neanthes we do not know more than that he was indirectly a disciple of Isocrates through Timaeus and Philiscus and wrote a work *Περὶ ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν*, of which there are considerable fragments.

¹ *Ἀρίστιππος* is part of the title as in *Cato Maior De senectute*.

² Proclus in *Plat. Tim.* I 28: *φληναφοῦσι Καλλίμαχος καὶ Δοῦρις ὡς Πλάτωνος οὐκ ὄντος ἱκανοῦ κρίνειν ποιητάς*.

In a city like Athens where political interests predominated, it was only to be expected that the political activities of Plato and the Academy should provoke enmity and malice. The anti-platonic tradition on the political side underwent a transformation in the course of time, but there are certain recurrent features in the criticism. In the first place, it should be stressed, Plato did not himself take any active part in Athenian politics. He ironically makes Callicles give expression to the public sentiment on the subject¹: young lads ought to devote their time to philosophy. »But when I see an elderly man still going on with philosophy and not getting rid of it, that is the gentleman, Socrates, whom I think in need of a whipping. For as I said just now, this person, however well endowed he may be, is bound to become unmanly through shunning the centres and marts of the city, in which as Homer said, »men get themselves note and glory«. He must cower down and spend the rest of his days whispering in a corner with three or four lads, and never utter anything free or high or spirited.» Nevertheless, Plato criticized the conduct of policy in his home city and — and that was worse — the pettifogging politicians bred there. *Politics.*
Demochares

Secondly, Plato's travels to Sicily furnished a subject for comments. Thirdly his relations with the neighbouring lordlings and princes were regarded with a suspicious eye as being a token of the general antidemocratic sympathies of the Academy. The relations to Philip of Macedonia in particular were viewed with mistrust, and later on, after the death of Plato, the Macedonian relations of the Academy and Lyceum were one of the chief causes of public attacks, culminating in the attempt of Demochares in 306 to eradicate the philosophers altogether. In addition to the animosity that had its roots in actual political life, there was widespread opposition to his literary work that dealt with political themes and his theories on education. When after 300 political enmities had died away — politics had practically ceased to exist for Athens — the fight was fought on the theoretical field only, that is to say against Plato's political theories and especially his theory of the Ideal State. With the lapsing time the polemic grows more and more vulgar and scurrilous. Already in the time of

¹ *Gorgias* 485 D, Lamb's translation.

Herodicus we can envisage how simplified the problems had become, and after him until far into the time of the emperors and the Holy Fathers it has hardened into a rule that all political polemic against Plato must start from a distortion of Plato's doctrine of the community of women. How strong this anti-platonic tradition, turning on political dissension, was, we are able to see for instance from the following passage in Josephus *c. Apionem* II 31: Πλάτων θαναζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ὥς καὶ σεμνότητι βίου διενεγκὼν καὶ δυνάμει¹ λόγων καὶ πειθοῖ πάντας ὑπεράρας τοὺς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ γεγονότας ὑπὸ τῶν φασκόντων δεινῶν εἶναι τὰ πολιτικὰ μικροῦ δεῖν χλευαζόμενος καὶ κωμωδούμενος διατελεῖ.

Of the contemporary criticism of Isocrates and his school I have already spoken.² In Sicily Plato had a severe opponent in Philistus³, who is described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus as *κολακικός καὶ φιλοτύραννος καὶ ταπεινὸς καὶ μικρολόγος*. It is not impossible that Plato's words in the *Theaetetus* 175 D τὸν σμικρὸν ἐκεῖνον τὴν ψυχὴν, aim at Philistus. There is nothing about Plato in the fragments of Philistus preserved, but probably a good deal of the slander about Plato's travels to Sicily, his motives and his adventures with Dionysius and on the way home, originated in the work of Philistus. Plutarch avouches that he was »a man eminently skilled in inventing specious pretences and fair speeches to cloak unjust actions and evil dispositions»⁴. His work must certainly have been utilized by all historians who dealt with the same subject, and although Timaeus censures him, he has undoubtedly transcribed from him a good deal.⁵ In Dion's expedition to Sicily many of Plato's

¹ Compare Alexis' *Ἰππεύς* fr. 94 τοὺς τὰς τῶν λόγων δυνάμεις παραδιδόντας, discussed above p. 84.

² On the *Republic* 500 B ~ *Antidosis* 260 see Bergk, *Fünf Abh.* p. 38 and Rudberg, *Symb. Osl.* II p. 9, cfr above p. 144 note 1. Compare the criticism of οἱ νόμοι καὶ αἱ πολιτεῖαι αἱ ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν γεγραμμέναι after the death of Plato, *Philipp.* 12, and how Isocrates in his political testament *Παναθηναϊκός* 118 scornfully talks of his adversaries in the Academy as ὀλίγοι τινὲς τῶν προσποιουμένων εἶναι σοφῶν κτλ.

³ Plat. *Ep.* 3 p. 315 E: ἄδην γὰρ ὑπὸ Φιλιστίδου καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πρὸς τοὺς μισθοφόρους καὶ εἰς τὸ Συρακοσίῳν πλῆθος διεβλήθη.

⁴ Dion 36, p. 974 C: ὧν δεινότητος ἀδίκους πράγμασιν καὶ πονηροῖς ἡθεσιν εὐσχήμονας αἰτίας περιβαλεῖν καὶ λόγους ἔχοντας κόσμον ἐξευρεῖν.

⁵ Both Timaeus and Neanthes tell the same story of Plato's *λογκλοπεία* probably after Philistus, see Fenk p. 67.

friends and disciples took part¹ and the failure cast deep shadows on the Academy.

Also at the Macedonian court intrigues were spun against Plato. Speusippus, in his letter to Philippus², says that he has heard that Theopompus, who in 342 stayed at the court, calumniated Plato. In the Platonic collection of letters and the *Epistulae Socraticae* an echo of this political activity reaches us.

During the time of Demetrius of Phaleron the political opposition towards the philosophers dared not manifest itself openly, but as soon as Poliorcetes in 307 conquered Athens and Demochares, the nephew of Demosthenes, assumed power, the attacks on the philosophers began afresh and bolder tactics were employed. Demochares, the pretended arch-democrat, prepared to enforce the most anti-democratic measure possible.³ Aided by a certain Sophocles he carried through a law, according to which no philosopher was allowed to open a school. We know this through Pollux and Diogenes. Pollux IX 42 says: νόμος Ἀττικὸς κατὰ τῶν φιλοσοφούντων γραφεὶς ὃν Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμφικλείδου Σουνιεύς εἶπεν, ἐν ᾧ τινα κατὰ αὐτῶν προειπῶν ἐπήγαγε μὴ ἐξεῖναι μηδὲν ἐν τῶν σοφιστῶν διατριβήν κατὰ σκευάσασθαι. And Diog. Laert. V 38: μηδένα τῶν φιλοσόφων σχολῆς ἀφηγεῖσθαι, εἰ μὴ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ δόξη· εἰ δὲ μὴ, θάνατον εἶναι τὴν ζημίαν. It is obvious that Pollux and Diogenes proceeded on independent lines, and it is remarkable that Pollux apparently had access to the original.

All the philosophers at once fled; that Theophrastus is mentioned expressly is owing to the fact that the law was naturally directed first and foremost against the partisans of Demetrius among the Peripatetics but also to the fact that he was the most famous among the philosophers of that time.

¹ Plut. *Dion* 22 συνέπραττον δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων.

² *Epist. Socr.* 30 (28 Köhler), 13.

³ On Demochares' action against the philosophers read Wilamowitz *Antigonos* p. 194 and the excursus on the legal side p. 270. There is a great variance in the judgments on Demochares. While Blass *Att. Bereds.* III 2 p. 304 and Ladé *Wiener Studien* 13 (1891) p. 126, praise him as »einer der letzten unabhängig gesinnten Staatsmänner Athens«, Wilamowitz has depicted him as a knave devoid of honour. The middle course is perhaps more correct, as Pöhlman says *Griech. Gesch.*, Müllers Handb. III 443. At any rate he was a very simple man.

Some months afterwards, however, Philo, a disciple of Aristotle, returned, accusing Sophocles *παρανόμων*. During the legal proceedings, in spring 306, Demochares made a speech *ὑπὲρ Σοφοκλέα πρὸς Φίλωνα*, the only one of his speeches known to us. The following fragments are known.

1) Athenaeus 610 F. *Καὶ Σοφοκλῆς δέ τις ψηφίσματι ἐξήλασε πάντας φιλοσόφους τῆς Ἀττικῆς, καθ' οὗ λόγον ἔγραψε Φίλων ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμος, ἀπολογίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους Δημοχάρους πεποιηκότος τοῦ Δημοσθένους ἀνεπιού.* Probably after the *Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα* by Crystius.

2) Aristocles *ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ Περὶ φιλοσοφίας αφ. Euseb. Praef. Evang.* XV 2,6 *Τὴν μὲν γὰρ Δημοχάρους κατηγορίαν κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων τί χρὴ λέγειν; οὐ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλην μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους κακῶς εἴρηκεν. ἔτι γε μὴν αὐτὰς τὰς διαβολὰς σκοπῶν ἂν τις ληρεῖν αὐτὸν φαίη. λέγει γὰρ ἐπιστολὰς Ἀριστοτέλους ἀλῶναι κατὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἀθηναίων, καὶ Στάγειρα τὴν πατρίδα προδοῦναι Μακεδόσιν αὐτόν. ἔτι δὲ κατασκαφείσης Ὀλύνθου μηνύειν ἐπὶ τοῦ λαφυροπωλίου Φιλίππῳ τοὺς πλουσιωτάτους τῶν Ὀλυνθίων.* The author was interested in the calumnia of Aristotle only.

3) Other fragments are: the chapter XI 119, above p. 39 and 83, and many other portions in the *Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσωκράτην* of Herodicus, which cannot be delimited with certainty, but are discussed in my commentary, 215 C (p. 41), 220 E (p. 71), 505 C (p. 72), 507 A (p. 79), 509 A (p. 83—86).

4) It is probably possible to reconstruct a fragment from *schol. in Nubes* 144, treated in my commentary to 218 E, above p. 62.¹

Old Jonsius² was the first who saw that this speech had constituted one of the more important sources for the later defamation of the philosophers, especially for the slander of Aristotle as well as the other philosophers³, and this has afterwards been stressed by Luzac and Wilamowitz. Owing to the nature of the material we cannot, however, with any claim to certainty quote more fragments than those where his name is given and that is not much. But evidently Hero-

¹ The fragments were collected by Baiter-Sauppe in *Oratores Att.* II 341.

² *De scriptor. histor. philos.* (1659) I 17,4.

³ This is clear from *fr.* 2 above.

dicus, through Carystius (c. 210) and Hegesander (c. 170), has taken some material from his speech. There is still an echo of his rhetoric in the exclamatory *τοιούτοι εἰσὶν* 509 B, 215 C and 220 E, and the whole peroration of Herodicus with the Gorgian *ταῦτ' ὠφεληθεὶς ἐκ τῆς καλῆς Πολιτείας καὶ τῶν παρανόμων Νόμων* is, as Wilamowitz¹ has pointed out, a direct quotation.

Philon won. Sophocles was fined to pay five talents. The philosophers began to return. Poliorcetes, who was already away on new cruises, does not seem to have loved Demochares, by whom he was afterwards badly denigrated.

The polemic carried on by the followers of Isocrates against Aristotle and the Academy was both severe and protracted, but in trenchancy it was surpassed by the acrimony of the Epicureans.² Cicero mentions besides the master of the school also Metrodorus, who wrote *Πρὸς τὸν Πλάτωνος Γοργίαν* in at least 2 books and *Πρὸς τὸν Πλάτωνος Εὐθύφωνα*³, Hermarchus, who wrote *Πρὸς Πλάτωνα* and *Πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην*³, and the Athenian hetaera Leontion, the disciple and mistress of Epicurus, who wrote a treatise against Theophrastus.⁴ There is further the impetuous and contentious Colotes and Zenon Epicureus, a contemporary of Cicero, who gave Socrates the beautiful surname *scurra Atticus*, and lastly the friend of Epicurus, Idomeneus. Of all these Colotes is most well-known through Plutarch, who has censured his pamphlet *Ὅτι κατὰ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων δόγματα οὐδὲ ζῆν ἐστιν*. Plutarch gives us a vivid picture of his manner and style 1086 D and also enumerates some of the scurrilous words by which he designated his opponents: *τὰ γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποις αἰσχιστα ῥήματα, βωμολοχίας* (one who stole meat from the altars, a common abusive word even in the old comedy), *ληκθυισμούς* (of one who pours out his speech as from an oil-can, cfr *Ran.* 1198—1200), *ἀλαζονείας, ἐταιρήσεις* (always used in bad sense, unchastity), *ἀνδροφονίας*,

¹ Curiously enough Wilamowitz cuts out the word *νῦν* which still more effectively betrays that it is not a revision but the original text of Demochares.

² See above all the letter *Περὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων* fr. 171 Us. and 227, where Sextus Empiricus witnesses his *δυσμένεια* towards Plato, further fr. 238 = Diog. Laert. X 8, Crönert *Kolotes u. Menedemos* p. 17 ff.

³ See further Körte, *Metrodorus* p. 546.

⁴ Cicero *de nat. deor.* I 33.

βαρυστόνους (also used by Epicurus *fr.* 114), πολυφθόρους (a typically tragic word degraded by vulgar polemic), βαρυεγκεφάλους (presumably by drinking too much wine) συναγαγόντες. And we can see from the fragments 231—234 that these coarse words were a typical feature of the Epicurean polemic and represented its peculiar contribution to the anti-platonic tradition.

Colotes is the author of a series of pamphlets against Plato. We know the following titles: *Πρὸς τὸν Πλάτωνος Εὐθύδημον*, *Πρὸς τὸν Πλάτωνος Λύσιν*. A third work of his was perhaps entitled *Πρὸς τοὺς Πλάτωνος μύθους* or *Περὶ τῶν παρὰ Πλάτωνι μυθικῶς πεπλασμένων*.¹ Some passages from Colotes' polemic against the 10th book of the *Republic* were, as Crönert points out, transcribed by some unknown commentator of Plato. This commentary was read by Macrobius and Porphyry. Porphyry's writings were studied by Proclus, who in his commentary on the *Republic*² discusses the views of Colotes. The passage in Macrobius runs as follows³: *Epicureorum tota factio, aequo semper errore a vero devia et illa aestimans ridenda quae nesciat, sacrum volumen et augustissima irrisit naturae seria. Colotes vero, inter Epicuri auditores loquacitate notabilior, etiam in librum rettulit quae de hoc amarius cavillatus est. Sed cetera quae iniuria notavit... omittenda sunt: illam calumniam persequemur quae, nisi supplodetur, manabit Ciceroni cum Platoni communis. Ait a philosopho fabulam non oportuisse confingi, quoniam nullum figmenti genus veri professoribus conveniret. Cur enim, inquit, si rerum caelestium notionem, si habitum nos animarum docere voluisti, non simplici et absoluta hoc insinuatione curatum est, sed quaesita persona, casusque excogitata novitas et composita advocati scena figmenti ipsam quaerendi veri ianuam mendacio polluerunt?* This seems to be a translation of the words of Colotes. The *professores veri*, προφήται ἀληθείας, of Colotes, reminds us of the προφήται ἀτόμων, an insulting word preserved by Herodicus 187 B.

¹ See Crönert, *Kolotes u. Menedemos* p. 12.

² Especially II 105 Kroll: ὁ μὲν Ἐπικούρειος Κωλώτης ἐγκαλεῖ τῷ Πλάτωνι, ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀφείς τὴν ἐπιστημονικὴν περὶ τὸ ψεῦδος διατρίβει μυθολογῶν ὡς ποιητής, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποδεικνὺς ὡς ἐπιστήμων· καὶ ὅτι πρὸς ἑαυτὸν μαχόμενος ἐν μὲν γε προομιλοῖς τῆςδε τῆς πραγματείας ἐλοιδόρησε τοὺς ποιητὰς κτλ. Then he goes into the matter in considerable detail.

³ *Comm. in Somn. Scip.* I 2,3.

Among the disciples of Aristotle an increasing interest is devoted to studies akin to what we usually call biography. Different attempts are made and different lines of approach tried out. Theophrastus composes his ethical characters — no biography in our sense of the word. Chamaeleon confines himself to fanciful reconstructions of the lives of ancient poets from Homer down to Aeschylus. Phaenias indeed writes *Περὶ τῶν Σωκρατικῶν*, the first instance known to us of the application of the method of encyclopaedic biography to a philosophical school¹, a work of which we however know very little. Dicaearchus writes about various philosophers, though I should not dare call his writings biographies. As far as I can see Aristoxenus must be regarded as the first biographer in the proper sense of the word. Leo was perhaps exaggerating when he called him the Founder of Literary Biography, but Stuart has hardly succeeded in dethroning him from the eminence he occupies in the history of biography.

Aristoxenus, Hieronymus of Rhodes and Satyrus is a triumvirate, whose calumnatory writings Luzac has perstringed with a censorious fling, not unlike the manner of Aristoxenus himself. In spite of all exaggerations Luzac is on the whole right, and Stuart, who discusses at length the modern attempts at rehabilitating Aristoxenus, sums up with the following words to which I fully agree: As I read them, neither the remnants of the *Life of Socrates* nor the very meagre remains of the *Life of Plato* justify essential modifications of the prevalent view² of the shortcomings of Aristoxenus as a biographer.

Aristoxenus was a brilliant and highly gifted musician. Perhaps this to a certain degree explains his astounding onesidedness and highly conceited diction. Thus even Cicero in a poignant appreciations pleads: »shoemaker, stick to your last».³ An attempt to explain his rather odd attitude towards the Academy is found in ancient tradition, which asserts that he was rejected when the successor of

¹ Thus D. R. Stuart, *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, p. 133.

² Also expressed by ancient critics, Aristocles *ap. Euseb. Praep. Evang.* XV 2, τῷ δ' ἂν πεισθῇ τοῖς ὑπ' Ἀριστοξένου . . . λεγομένοις; Compare Plutarch. *De malign. Herod.* 856 C.

³ The wellknown *canere ipse doceat — quam quisque norit artem in hac se exerceat*, *Tusc.* I 18.

Aristotle was to be elected. His pythagorizing bias contributed to set him against his predecessors and contemporaries, especially against Socrates and Plato, who were regarded by him as corruptors of the true doctrine of Pythagoras. Burnet¹ is quite right in regarding this as the chief motive of his attitude towards Socrates and Plato. It is, after all, the eternally observable phenomenon of a difference of views leading to personal difference. *Πολλὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐστι προσκρούματα· μισεῖ μὲν γὰρ ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον· ἀντιδοξοῦσιν δὲ ἑαυτοῖς διὰ τὴν ἀλαζονείαν τόπους ἐπιλεγόμενοι τοὺς προύχοντας.*²

Thus we cannot escape the conclusion that Aristoxenus is one of the most bitter *obtrectatores Platonis* in the Greek history of philosophy, but this fact by no means detracts from his indisputable greatness as a musical theorist.

Of his *vita Platonis* only three insignificant fragments are known, yet they are enough to enable us to discern the main tendency. There is, however, all the more left of his biography of Socrates. A long series of the most well-known malevolent anecdotes mention Aristoxenus as the primary source. Porphyry, who also studied the musical writings of Aristoxenus for his commentary on the *Harmonics* of Ptolemy, freely utilized his biographical writings too for his great work *Φιλόσοφος Ἱστορία*, and this book again proved a mine of wealth for the calumny of the Christian Fathers during the fourth and fifth century. But even Cyril, who is by no means averse to vilifying the old philosophers, thinks that Aristoxenus goes too far, and so he adds a reservation in regard to him and Timaeus, saying *εἰ δὲ ὁ μὲν διὰ δυσμένειαν ἀξιόπιστος, ὁ δὲ διὰ ἡλικίαν*³. Some time later, Socrates Scholasticus, the famous church-historian, pronounces a shattering verdict on the work of Porphyry, including its principal source, Aristoxenus⁴.

The biographical writings of Aristoxenus exercised a fatal effect as Greek literature always tended to be under the thumb of tradition. The individual bias of the first important representative of a certain species of literature inevitably leaves its mark on the subsequent development of that literature for a long time to come, and in the

¹ *Early Greek Phil.* p. 153.

² Tatianus *Or. ad Graecos* 6. In vain Plato hoped *φθόνος γὰρ ἔξω θεῶν χοροῦ*.

³ *Contra Julian*, VI, PGM LXXVI, 818 C.

⁴ Quoted at the end of this chapter.

case we are considering tradition won ready support. The seed was fruitful and the soil was unusually fertile.

In Hieronymus of Rhodes Aristoxenus found a follower who showed himself an expert at the art of literary persiflage. He especially cultivated erotic motifs and goes further than most other authors in the shamelessness of his calumny¹. Satyrus, who wrote his work *Bíoi* during the reign of Philopator (221—204) can hardly have been his direct disciple — the difference in age seems a little too great — but still it is evident that he has trodden in the steps of Aristoxenus and Hieronymus; these three men are often mentioned together², and their attitude towards Socrates and Plato is the same. How his contemporaries judged him, is shown by the malicious Stratoniceus, who *μάλιστα δὲ θαυμάζειν ἔφη τὴν τοῦ σοφιστοῦ Σατύρου μητέρα, ὅτι ὄν οὐδεμία πόλις ἐνεγκεῖν οἷα τε δέκα ἡμέρας, ἐκεῖνη δέκα μῆνας ἤνεγκε*.³

Here ends the first phase of the anti-platonic tradition. It is Conclusions always back to this period that we have to go in seeking for the primary sources, from which later developments proceeded. Everything written subsequently on this subject can, I am sure, be traced back to a *fons et origo* from this time. Let us now, therefore, in summing up see what these primary sources of all later *obtrectatio* Platonis looked like, reminding ourselves of the fact that the polemic always centres round four principal themes, namely personal matters, political activity, questions of philosophy and questions of style and language.

a) The foremost source for all later *obtrectatores* is of course constituted by the preserved writings of Plato and the other Socratics. The scribbles of Herodicus show to what a high degree these sources were utilized, and fully reveal how unscrupulously these writers set to work in selecting suitable passages and adjusting them in order to produce the tendency desired. By this method, the quoting of what was frequently only the pretended original wording, an air of genuineness and authenticity was imparted to one's allegations.

¹ See e. g. Athen. 557 E. 604 D.

² Luzac, *Lectiones Atticae*, Leyden 1809, p. 172 ff., deals at length with this triumvirate.

³ Ath. 350 F.

Evidently it could be taken for granted that few if any persons would take the pains to verify the quotations. The writers were doubtless fully conscious of the fact that the method involved systematic counterfeit. The advantages of pursuing such a method did not escape Lucian, one of the foremost *obtretractores omnium*, who in a little pamphlet entitled *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥαδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῇ* proceeds in a rather scientific way to give an account of it with special reference to oral slander, c. 13: *τό τε ἀξιόπιστον τῆς διαβολῆς οὐχ ὥς ἔτυχεν ἐπινοοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ πᾶν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἔργον δεδοικόσι τι προσάφαι ἀπωδὸν ἢ καὶ ἀλλότριον. ὥς γοῦν ἐπιπολὺ τὰ προσόντα τῷ διαβαλλομένῳ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον μεταβάλλοντες οὐκ ἀπιθάνους ποιοῦνται τὰς κατηγορίας.* Much more of the material belonging to personal history than one is usually prone to believe, originates in forced and arbitrary interpretations of words, expressions or passages in the writings of the Socratics. Further there is the oral tradition growing up around Diogenes and the Cynics¹. Just how this tradition has reached us through Diogenes Laertius and other late compilers, cannot with certainty be determined.

b) Secondly there is the contemporary comedy down to about 300. The polemic is fairly innocuous in regard to Plato; his followers are attacked more boldly. We catch glimpses of many of the chief questions of Platonic philosophy. Motive and tendency are clear enough: it was the job of the comic writer to ridicule the topics of the hour.²

c) The polemic emanating from Isocrates and his school was sharpened from about 350 onwards, and during the time of Aristotle it is worked up into a campaign of implacable malignity. Motive and tendency: totally different conceptions of the aim and method of true education, afterwards vulgarized into a fight about the principles of rhetoric. Last important representative is Aelius Aristides.

d) Plato's Sicilian travels and his relations with the Macedonian court and various petty princes were an offence to many. After Plato's death the anti-macedonian party directed violent assaults against the philosophers, especially those of the Lyceum, who got

¹ Diogenes on Plato, see G. Rudberg, *Zur Diogenestradition*, Symb. OsI. 14 (1935) p. 30. The *κουρεακή καὶ πάνδημος λαλιά* is derided by Polybius III 20.

² Anaxandrides II 159 K. *χρὴ γὰρ εἰς ὄχλον φέρειν ἅπανθ' ὅς ἂν τις καινότητ' ἔχειν δοκῇ.*

no peace until the time of Demetrius. When Demetrius surrendered in 307 the persecution culminated in the unsuccessful attempt of Demochares, in spring 306, to expel all the philosophers. Motive: political dissensions, as a rule vulgarized in the shape of political rancour.

Later this polemic develops into a criticism of the political ideas of Plato.

e) The Epicureans keep up a running stream of vulgar abusive words. The motives are obscure: the sectarian character of the Garden involved a generally hostile attitude towards all other trends; the stamp of personal resentment is ever present.

f) The biographies of Aristoxenus exercised a fatal influence on this literary genre as a whole — the so-called school of peripatetic biography — owing to the personal note. Motive: pythagorean fanaticism, personal aversion and the conceit of a musician. The revival of Aristoxenus in the work of Porphyry strongly influenced the patristic literature of the fourth century.

The body of traditions thus created was now poured into the melting-pot. I have already indicated how the fashionable authors of the third century dealt with the material. Satyrus, however, inaugurates a new epoch, whose foremost representative during the second half of the century is Hermippus. These Alexandrian continuators differ¹ from their peripatetic predecessors just as the literature as a whole undergoes a transformation. The time now comes for sifting and sorting out the material and working it up. Material is collected from every quarter with the help of the treasures of the Alexandrian library and scientifically arranged. For every particular fact or piece of information the source was mentioned, and where no sources could be quoted, appeal was made to the spoken word. When there is no tradition at all at hand, recourse is had to the old method of text-interpretation, developed by Aristotle and especially Chamaeleon.²

*Herodicus and
his followers*

As the book-producing industry gathered momentum and libraries were established, the book-learned *γυμνοβόμβυκες* became a more

¹ See Leo p. 118 ff, Stuart p. 155 ff, compare Heibges in the *RE* VIII 845.

² Leo is hardly right in designating this method an invention of the Alexandrian biographers, p. 132.

and more common type who soon established a sway over literature. The writing of learned dissertations began in earnest. How a Roman, relatively untainted by book culture¹, regarded these quasi-learned Graeculi, may be seen from some high-spirited verses which Plautus inserted de suo in the *Curculio* 288:

*Tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant,
qui incedunt suffarcinati cum libris, cum sportulis,
constant, conferunt sermones inter se drapetae.*

To this class of γραμματολικριφίδες belonged Herodicus of Babylon, disciple of Crates. In the matter of exterior conditions of work the Pergamene school was a copy of the Museum of Alexandria and it enjoyed its short prime during the reign of Eumenes II and especially Attalus II Philadelphus (159—138).

It is not easy to say from where Herodicus derived his fanatically anti-platonic bias. Personal motives, unknown to us, may well have played some part. His philosophic masters, Diogenes, who was his compatriot, and Antipater, were perpetually fighting, it is true, with the coryphaei of the Academy of those times, but it is an actual fact that among the scanty remnants of the writings of Antipater, we find the title of a pamphlet "Ὅτι κατὰ Πλάτωνα μόνον τὸ καλόν. It is not likely that any of these Stoics were enemies of Plato. And with the third contemporary Stoic philosopher, Panaetius, Stoicism decidedly takes a step towards Plato, and what Plato means to the philosophy of Posidonius it is unnecessary to stress. Thus it is unlikely that Herodicus conceived his dislike of Plato from his Stoic masters.

The anti-platonic bias in the writings of Herodicus must be regarded as an aberration of the Pergamene Homerolatry². In his peculiar way he rebuts the Platonic criticism of Homer. It is probable that it was his extensive occupation with the literature of comedy and biographic slander, a familiarity which we may postulate in view of his major work on the *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*, that instigated his assaults on Plato. Full of admiration for the Great Poet he met in

¹ Compare the quotation from Polybius, above p. 127, note 2.

² There are a few traces of Antisthenian influence in Crates' conception of Homer (see Helck p. 39) but I do not think this has been the gateway of anti-platonic influence.

this literature the distorted picture of Plato, who had expelled his idol from the ideal community of men. Thus two streams met: the Cratetean Homerolatry and Aristoxenean anti-platonism; the resultant product may be seen in the writings of Herodicus and his followers.

His work must, as has been previously observed, be regarded as an essentially original work, although needless to say he has made use of different sources. Probably he has himself excerpted Plato, Aeschines and Antisthenes¹. His exhaustive analysis of chronological errors testifies to the fact that he was well acquainted with his subject and was able to draw on a valuable and extensive literature. The same must be true of his chief work *Κωμωδοῦμενοι*, for which accession to an extensive literature would be necessary and much preparatory study. Herodicus, though intellectually a second-rater, was certainly no numskull.

The Herodicean comparison between Plato and Homer represents the oldest work in this literary genre. The subject attracted, however, many successors. Not much later² is the *Ὀμηρικὰ Προβλήματα* of Heraclitus, a rather enigmatic work. Reinhardt³ has shown that Heraclitus and the anonymous author of the pseudo-Plutarchean *Vita Homeri* have utilized the same source; still there is an important addition in Heraclitus, namely the criticism of Plato, to which there is no correspondence at all in the other work. In the source common to both works Plato was mentioned but with no critical animadversions at all. The violent censure of Plato and Epicurus too in the work of Heraclitus shows such astonishing analogies to the same tendency in the works of Herodicus⁴, that one is tempted to assume

¹ Dittmar's discussion, *Aeschines v. Sphettos* p. 18, does not seem convincing. The remarks on Alcibiades seem to be extracts from the biography by Antisthenes; the excerpt which Satyrus *ap. Ath.* 534 adduces on the *παρανομία* of Alcibiades corresponds exactly to the short quotation from Antisthenes which Herodicus furnishes 220 C.

² The author carefully avoids hiatus; see the introduction to Oelmann's edition, Teubner 1910, p. 31. This and other circumstances make it necessary to assume that the work was written before the force of atticism asserted itself.

³ C. Reinhardt, *De Graecorum Theologia*, D. Berlin 1910.

⁴ Essential feature, Heraclit. 78: *τοιγαροῦν εἰκότως ὁ μὲν Ὀμήρου λόγος ἡρώων ἐστὶ βίος, οἱ δὲ Πλάτωνος διάλογοι μειρακίων ἔρωτες. καὶ πάντα παρ' Ὀμήρου γεννικῆς ἀρετῆς γέμει. 79 πρὸς μὲν οὖν Πλάτωνα καὶ πλείω λέγειν δυνάμενος ἔω, τοῦνομα τῆς*

that he has a finger in the pie, in some way or another. Nothing can however be alleged with any certainty, as there are no obvious verbal borrowings. A later follower of the Pergamene school, Telephus, during Hadrians' reign wrote on the *σχήματα ῥητορικά* of Homer and *Περὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου καὶ Πλάτωνος συμφωνίας* but nothing but the title is known.

In the scholia *I* 540 is quoted a work by a certain Ammonius with the title *Περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος μετενηγεγμένων ἐξ Ὀμήρου*. Ammonius is often quoted by Didymus, and in schol. *K* 397 he gives some information as to his person, *εἴ τι χρὴ πιστεύειν Ἀμμωνίῳ τῷ διαδεξαμένῳ τὴν σχολήν*¹. He is thus the disciple of Aristarchus, and after the interregnum of Cydas he took the lead of the Museum. For this reason it is of course impossible that the work dealt with such borrowings from Homer as Herodicus claims. Nor does *τὰ ἐξ Ὀμήρου μετενηγεγμένα* signify textual variants and readings, as Blau and Susemihl suggest. The work dealt with the Platonic use of metaphors from Homer. It has thus nothing to do with the anti-platonic tradition.

Evidently influenced by this current of literature is, however, Dion of Prusa², whose attitude towards Homer Valgimigli has treated. Starting from oratio *LIII Περὶ Ὀμήρου* Dion reviews the various estimates of Homer entertained by Plato, Antisthenes and Crates. His anti-platonic attitude is especially obvious in oratio *LV Περὶ Ὀμήρου καὶ Σωκράτους* and in the speeches *Περὶ βασιλείας*. With Plato's opinion of Homer as a pernicious poet Dion contrasts his own view, in which he apparently follows Antisthenes but also the Pergamene school. In the or. *X Τρωικὸς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰλίου μὴ ἄλῶναι*, which must of course be regarded as a jeu d'esprit, the pretended thesis³ is supported by well-known arguments from the school of

Σωκρατικῆς σοφίας αἰδούμενος. ὁ δὲ φαίετ' ἐκ φιλόσοφος Ἐπίκουρος . . . παρ' Ὀμήρου κέκλοφεν κτλ. Heraclitus quotes Herodicus nominately once, see above chapter IV, fragment 9.

¹ Discussed by Ahrens *Bucol.* II p. XXXVII, A. Blau, *De Aristarchi discipulis*, D. Jena 1883 p. 6, and Rohde, *Rhein. Mus.* 33 (1878) p. 168.

² M. Valgimigli, *La critica letteraria di Dione Crisostomo*. Contributi alla storia d. critica lett. in Graecia I, Bologna 1913.

³ *Εἰ μὲν οὖν παρ' Ἀργείοις ἐτόλμων ἀντιλέγειν Ὀμήρῳ καὶ τὴνποίησιν αὐτοῦ δεικνύναι ψευδῆ περὶ τὰ μέγιστα, τυχόν ἂν εἰκότως ἤχθοντό μοι καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐξέβαλλον* (this is a reversal of the usual argument).

literary polemic, in which, as Valgimigli points out, we can perceive two or, as I prefer to say, three fundamental critical currents, viz. a) the specifically philosophic trend, emanating from Pythagoras, Heraclitus of Ephesus and Xenophanes and culminating in the rigorous condemnation of Plato, b) the moralistic-pedagogic allegorical interpretation, emanating from the Cynic and Stoic schools and culminating in the Pergamene Homerolatry, and finally c) the logico-rationalistic interpretation of the Alexandrian grammarians, codified by Aristarchus, which from the Alexandrian *ὑπομνήματα* has made its way into and now dominates our corpus scholiorum.

Still, even in the scholia **BT** there are traces of the Pergamene writings, notably excerpted from the Problems of Heraclitus, likewise in Porphyry's *Ὀμηρικὰ Ζητήματα* and Cornutus' *Περὶ θεῶν*. During the reign of Hadrian the Alexandrian rhetor Aelius Sarapis wrote *Εἰ δικαίως Πλάτων Ὀμηρον ἀπέπεμψε τῆς Πολιτείας*, and some years later the peripatetic Aristocles Messenius *Πότερον σπουδαιότερος Ὀμηρος ἢ Πλάτων*. Only the titles, however, are known of these works. Also Numenius, who belongs to the latter half of the second century, adopted the allegorical interpretation of the Pergamenes, and round about the same time Lucian excerpted Heraclitus or his immediate source, as may be seen by comparing Heraclitus 77 and *De domo* 4. Plato has, says Heraclitus, summoned the Muses in order to talk with them — *περὶ τίνος εἵποιν' ἄν, ὃ θαυμασιώτατε Πλάτων*; Lucian answers rather more forthrightly than Heraclitus *καὶ οὐκ ἡσχύνετο γέρον ἄνθρωπος παρακαλῶν παρθένους συνεσομένας τὰ παιδευαστικά*.

One of the last great obtrectatores Platonis among the pagan *Lucian and Aristides* authors is of course Lucian. With the keenness of a modern journalist, who well knows the most effective means of making an impression on the public, and with the most egregious indifference to truth, he inserts in his numerous pamphlets calumnious remarks on Plato. There is personal slander in the Aristoxenean vein¹, and the usual political invectives² and vulgar polemics against his philosophy, especially the community of women.³ In other writings Lucian shows that he was fully aware of the true importance of the opinions of Socrates and Plato and their greatness as men, but to

¹ Plato as parasit, *Paras.* 34—35, as a bad soldier, *ib.* 43.

² Plato flattering the tyrants, *Dial. Mort.* 20.

³ *Conv.* 39, compare the explanations *Fug.* 18, *Icaromen.* 24.

this ingenious though amoral and unscrupulous man with his wholly negative disposition it was a matter of complete indifference whether he wrote in detraction or praise, whether he told the truth or not provided that he scored a hit with it and paved the way for his own advantage. His wit is notorious: in his description of the nether world in the *True History* II 17 he tells us various things about the departed spirits. *Εἶδον δὲ καὶ Σωκράτην τὸν Σωφρονίσκου ἀδολεσχοῦντα . . . ἐλέγετο δὲ χαλεπαίνειν αὐτῷ ὁ Ῥαδάμανθους καὶ ἠπειληκέναι πολλάκις ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς νήσου, ἣν φλυαρῇ καὶ μὴ ἐθέλλῃ ἀφείς τὴν εἰρωνεῖαν εὐώχεϊσθαι. Πλάτων δὲ μόνος οὐ παρῆν, ἀλλ' ἐλέγετο καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἀναπλασθείσῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πόλει οἰκεῖν χρώμενος τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τοῖς νόμοις οἷς συνέγραψεν.* In spite of his attacks on Plato Lucian was counted among the Platonists by the contemporary sophists and consequently was of the company of those whom Aristides in the name of Rhetoric fought against. On the other hand, the philosophers naturally did not enjoy being ridiculed in such a witty fashion.¹

Quite another type is Lucian's contemporary, the rhetor and sophist Aelius Aristides. His truly sophistic attitude appears from his beautiful confession² that it cost him as much fight with words and pain to describe Marathon and Salamis, as it cost the real soldiers in the battle itself. In the oration over the body of his teacher Alexander he says: *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς τὸν Πλάτωνα προισταμένοις καὶ περὶ τοῦτον μόνον φιλοσοφοῦσιν.* As a bitter enemy of all philosophers he directs his assaults chiefly against Plato. In both of the orations *Περὶ ῥητορικῆς* he imagines himself to have completely confuted Gorgias and with Plato's own weapons too. In the great speech *Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων* he tries to rehabilitate the statesmen attacked by Plato and censures Plato's diction as *οὐ πόρρω κακοηθείας.* The bad influence of Socrates is shown by Alcibiades, who certainly did not benefit by his association with Socrates.³ He also criticizes absurdities and anachronisms in the *Symposium* and the *Menexenus*⁴

¹ R. Helm, *Lucian und die Philosophenschulen*, NJB 11 (1902), p. 188 ff. »So ist er zwischen zwei Stühlen niedergesessen und totgeschwiegen worden».

² I 139,3 Jebb, 225 Dind. *ἀγωνιζόμεθα οὐδὲν ἐλάττω κατὰ τοὺς λόγους ἀγῶνα ἢ κατὰ τὰς πράξεις ἐκείνοι τότε.* An excellent self-portrait in *Περὶ παραφθέγματος*, II 378—384 Jebb, p. 159 sqq Keil.

³ II 124, Jebb, II 167 Dind.

⁴ II 286 Jebb, II 370 Dind., see my edition above p. 21 and 24 and the commentary.

in such a way that one is bound to conclude that he obtained material from the work of Herodicus. The whole polemic against Plato shows that Aristides had in fact no independent views on the subject of Plato's philosophy.¹ In one way his criticism of the Socratic verdict on rhetoric in the *Gorgias* is a pale and verbose continuation of the fight which Isocrates and his school fought.² One must also regard his criticism as a defence against the philosophers of his own time, whom he appropriately depicts.³

Finally some words must be added about the anti-platonic tradition in patristic literature, an extensive subject that can only be touched on here. The writings of the Christian Fathers — especially the apologetic *Cohortationes ad Graecos* — from Justin Martyr and onwards, as likewise the homiletic literature, contain innumerable remarks and judgments on the ancient philosophers. Even if the greater part consists of polemical material handed down from one writer to another, there is here and there much that would be worth collecting as of interest to our present enquiry. But this must be a task for some future study.

*The Christian
Fathers*

With regard to the attitude towards Plato and Socrates, the epoch may be divided into two main periods, with Porphyry's *Φιλόσοφος Ἰστορία* as the boundary stone. All contemporary or later church-fathers diligently quote this work.

For the early Fathers the works of Philo and Josephus played an important part. In the eyes of Philo, Plato is *ὁ ἱερώτατος*, and he has, as is well-known, borrowed thoughts as well as language from Plato and Posidonius. The same conception is found in Josephus: *τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους παραλείπω φιλοσόφους . . . Πλάτων δὲ θαυμαζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ὡς καὶ σεμνότητι βίου διενεγκὼν καὶ δυνάμει λόγων καὶ πειθοῖ πάντα ὑπεράρας τοὺς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ γεγονότας*,⁴ even if he does not abstain from mild criticism.⁵ Justin (A. D. c. 100—165) takes up the same leading ideas. »All those who have written,

¹ He confesses that, take it all in all, he has the same opinion as Plato, II 317, 10—13 Jebb, II 418 Dind.

² This he confesses himself, II 311 Jebb, II 407 Dind.

³ II 307 Jebb, 398 Dind. *εἶδωλα καμόντων, Ἀρχιλόχον πίθηκοι κτλ.*

⁴ *Contra Apion.* II 223, written about 95 A. D., cfr above p. 148.

⁵ II 225, 256.

have been able, thanks to the seed of reason naturally inborn in them, to perceive obscurely that which is. Those who have lived with the word are Christians, even though they have been considered atheists, Socrates and Heraclitus, for example, among the Greeks, and those who were like to them.» From Philo he adopts the idea that Plato when in Egypt became acquainted with the doctrines of Moses¹, but he is now the first to add a substantial portion of the well-known *obtrectatio Platonis* in the form of distorted biographical details. Plato, he says, on account of the fate of Socrates, was afraid of the accusations of Anytus λέγοντος· Πλάτων ἀδικεῖ καὶ περιεργάζεται θεοὺς οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει οὐ νομίζων.² φόβῳ γὰρ κωνεῖον ποικίλον τινὰ καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον τὸν περὶ θεὸν γυμνάζει λόγον, εἶναι τε θεοὺς τοῖς βουλευμένοις καὶ μὴ εἶναι οἷς τὰναντία δοκεῖ. He dared not mention the name of Moses to the Athenians δεδιὼς τὸν Ἀρειον πάγον.³ Here of course the question⁴ turns up, repeated afterwards again and again, »why does Plato really expel Homer from his State, when he himself is guilty of the same error of which he accuses Homer?»

Justin's follower Tatianus is hardly surpassed in factiousness and rancour towards the ancient philosophers by any other writer save perhaps John Chrysostom, and in the matter of ignorance he stands *facile princeps*. His λόγος πρὸς Ἑλλήνας contains numerous attacks on Plato of the simplest kind, for instance 142 D Πλάτων φιλοσοφῶν ὑπὸ Διονυσίου διὰ γαστριμαργίαν ἐπιπράσκετο, an old topic afterwards adopted by Tertullianus *Apologet.* 46: *Plato Dionysio ventris gratia venditur.*⁵ If you follow Plato, he says,⁶ you will be ham-

¹ Τί γάρ ἐστιν Πλάτων ἢ Μωσῆς ἀντικλῖων; so also Numenius *ap. Euseb. Praep. Evang.* XI 527 A = Clem. Al. *Strom.* I 24.

² A standard argument, compare *Acta Ap.* 17, 18.

³ *Coh. adv. Graec.* 20, PGM VI 276 C, repeated by Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* I 2, 6—7, Cyrillus *contra Julian.* I p. 34—35, Theodoretus *adv. Graec.* III 512, 519 and Augustinus *De vera relig.*, initio.

⁴ *Coh. adv. Graec.* 24, PGM VI 284, cfr 292 C (of Homer) τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τῆς πολιτείας ἐκβληθέντα ὡς ψεύστην (compare Dion Chrysostom above) καὶ τρίτον τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας, εἰδῶλων, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφη, μιμητὴν ὄντα (apparently from the vulgar philosophical polemic) Ὁμηρον.

⁵ Compare Greg. Naz. *or.* 3.

⁶ 162 C τοῖς Πλάτωνος ἔπη δόγμασιν, καὶ ὁ κατ' Ἐπίκουρον σοφιστεύων διαπρέσιος ἀνθίσταται σοι.

pered by an Epicurean, again if you follow Aristotle, the disciples of Democritus will fight against you with intense hatred. This theme, the antagonism between the old philosophers, from now on is frequently stressed in the apologetic literature and is the chief subject of the work of Hermeias *Διασυρμός τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων* and in the polemic of Theodoretus of Antiochia (c. 200). In his work the old favourite motif of the community of women turns up again.¹ *Καὶ πρῶτός γε Πλάτων, ὁ δοκῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς σεμνότερον πεφιλοσοφηκέναι, διαρρήδην ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βίβλῳ τῶν Πολιτειῶν (V 457 C) ἐπιγραφομένη τρόπῳ τινὶ νομοθετεῖ χρῆν εἶναι κοινὰς ἀπάντων τὰς γυναῖκας, χρώμενος παραδείγματι τῷ Διός.*

Clemens of Alexandria (c. 150—225) in his *Προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας* as is well-known, was strongly influenced by Plato, and his fundamental thought is, as in Philo, the idea that the old philosophers are forerunners of Christianity, *ὑποβάθρα τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν φιλοσοφίας*, a conception pursued and developed by Themistius, Libanius and Augustinus. Deep understanding of the Platonic philosophy also distinguishes Origenes (c. 180—250), although he of course emphatically champions the Christian faith in his apologetic work *Κατὰ Κέλσον*. Celsus had about A. D. 178 published a pamphlet, of which Origen in his extensive answer quotes nearly two thirds; in this he attacked Christianity starting from the Platonic philosophy. Plato is, however, mentioned with the utmost respect by Origen; indeed, in the discussion on the myth of Eros in the *Phaedrus*, Origen goes so far as to side with Plato against Celsus. The passage is worth quoting: *ἄρα γὰρ οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες τούτοις, ἐὰν μὲν τὴν κακοήθειαν τοῦ Κέλσου μιμῶνται, ὅπερ Χριστιανῶν ἀπειρή, καταγελάσσονται τοῦ μύθου, καὶ ἐν χλεύῃ θήσονται τὸν τηλικούτον Πλάτωνα· ἐὰν δὲ τὰ ἐν μύθου σχήματι λεγόμενα φιλοσόφως ἐξετάζοντες δυνήθωσιν εὐρεῖν τὸ βούλημα τοῦ Πλάτωνος, τίνα τρόπον δεδύνηται τὰ μεγάλα ἐαυτῷ φαινόμενα δόγματα κρύψαι μὲν πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐν τῷ τοῦ μύθου σχήματι, εἰπεῖν δ' ὡς ἔχρην τοῖς εἰδόσιν ἀπὸ μύθων εὐρίσκειν τὸ περὶ ἀληθείας τοῦ ταῦτα συντάξαντος βούλημα. τοῦτον δὲ παρὰ Πλάτῳ μῦθον ἐξεθέμην διὰ τὸν παρ' αὐτῷ τοῦ Διὸς κῆπον παραπλήσιόν τι ἔχειν δοκοῦντα τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν Πενίαν τῷ ἐκεῖ ὄφει παραβαλλομένην καὶ τὸν ὑπὸ τῆς Πενίας ἐπιβου-*

¹ *Ad Autolyc.* III 120 AB, PGM VI, possibly from Lucian. He has obviously not read the passage in the *Republic*.

λευόμενον Πόρον τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπιβουλευομένῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄφρους.¹ Thus the process of assimilation proceeds rapidly, but Plato is still only studied by the learned, remarks Origen. "Ἔστι γοῦν ἰδεῖν τὸν μὲν Πλάτωνα ἐν χερσὶ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι φιλολόγων μόνων, τὸν δὲ Ἐπίκτητον καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων καὶ ῥοπὴν πρὸς τὸ ὠφελεῖσθαι ἐχόντων θαυμάζομενον.² We find of course a good deal of the usual biographical slander, as for instance the ἀσωτία of Phaedo and Polemo³, the expulsion of Homer which Origen approves⁴, Socrates and the swan and the supernatural birth of Plato⁵, but the stories are rejected as fanciful *τερατεία καὶ διαβολή*.⁶ In the same spirit Origen expresses himself in the letter to Gregory⁷, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τῇ πάσῃ τῇ εὐφρύας δυνάμει σου ἐβουλόμην καταχρῆσασθαι σε τελικῶς μὲν εἰς Χριστιανισμόν, ποιητικῶς δὲ διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν ἠδξάμην παραλαβεῖν σε καὶ φιλοσοφίαν Ἑλλήνων τὰ οἰονεῖ εἰς Χριστιανισμόν δυνάμενα γενέσθαι ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα ἢ προπαιδεύματα, καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ γεωμετρίας καὶ ἀστρονομίας χρήσιμα ἐσόμενα εἰς τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν Γραφῶν διήγησιν, ἢν' ὅπερ φασὶ φιλοσόφων παῖδες περὶ γεωμετρίας καὶ μουσικῆς, γραμματικῆς τε καὶ ῥητορικῆς καὶ ἀστρονομίας (the *trivium* and *quadrivium*!) ὡς συνερίθων (*ancillae*) φιλοσοφία, τοῦθ' ἡμεῖς εἴπωμεν καὶ περὶ αὐτῆς φιλοσοφίας πρὸς Χριστιανισμόν.

This passage is a very important piece of evidence for the totally altered attitude towards ancient philosophy in the middle of the third century. Still, other times and other men were approaching and not until long afterwards would the ideas of Origen hold their own in the field of battle.

A contemporary of Origen was Hippolytus, who wrote *Katὰ πασῶν αἰρέσεων ἔλεγχος* and *Πρὸς Ἑλλήνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα*. The latter work is known to us through Photius⁸ and it is evident that Hippolytus follows up the line Philo-Clemens-Origenes, though his knowledge of Plato seems to be very superficial.

Tertullianus (c. 220), on the contrary, treads in the footsteps of

¹ *Contra Celsum* IV 533, PGM XI 1092 B, cfr Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* XII 11, Plotin. *Ennead.* III 5,6. Compare also Origen's interpretation of the *Theaetetus* 1192 C.

² *C. Cels.* 630, p. 1289 C.

³ *C. Cels.* 378 and with more details 472.

⁴ *ib.* 529.

⁵ *ib.* 635.

⁶ *ib.* 635.

⁷ PGM XI 88 A.

⁸ *Cod.* 48, δεικνυσὶ δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν στασιάζοντα Πλάτωνα.

Tatianus. He hates all Greek philosophy which in his eyes is the root and origin of all evil. With the bias for personally coloured polemic so typical of his style, he would certainly have had recourse to biographical slander much more, had he but been better acquainted with the sources. He confines himself for the most part to the usual abusive words¹ and a few stories which he probably took over from Tatianus.

Some time after Origen Porphyry wrote his *Φιλόσοφος Ἱστορία* and other biographical works, which were to prove important in respect of the developments that followed. In this work he has used Aristoxenus as his principal source for the life of Plato, and a current of anecdotes and slander from now on flows through the apologetic literature of the following century. Eusebius (c. 260—340) in his *Εὐαγγελικὴ προπαρασκευὴ* quotes him together with extracts from Atticus and Numenius.

During the fourth century, when patristic literature reached its zenith, the apologetic works are directed chiefly against Porphyry and Julian. I mention only four of the greatest anti-Platonists from this period, viz. Gregory, Cyril, John Chrysostom and Theodoretus.

All of them adopt an extremely hostile attitude towards ancient philosophy in general. The inventions of the Greek philosophers are, says Gregory of Nazianzus (dead in 390) λόγων στροφάς, ῥήσεις σοφῶν, αἰνίγματα, Πύρρωνος ἐνστάσεις ἐφέξεις ἀντιθέσεις, Χρυσίππου συλλογισμῶν τὰς διαλύσεις, Ἀριστοτέλους τεχνῶν τὴν κακοτεχνίαν, ἣ τῆς Πλάτωνος εὐγλωττίας τὰ γοητεύματα.² They invaded the Church ὥσπερ Αἰγυπτιακαὶ τινες μάστιγες.³ Still he himself complains of the *sophistica obtrectatio*: μέχρι τίνος γὰρ ταῦτα; καὶ ποῦ στησόμεθα τῆς σοφιστικῆς ἐπηρσείας; His conceit and his moral pathos is outstanding:⁴

Τί δ' ὁ Πλάτων σοι, καίπερ ὢν σοφώτατος
ἀνδρῶν; τί δ' Ἀρίστιππος, τὸν ἡδιστον λέγω;
τί δ' ὁ χαρίεις Σπένσιππος, ὥσπερ οἴομαι;

¹ When *Apologet.* 39 he styles the philosophers *lenones*, this is surpassed by the follower Salvianus, who exaggerates it into *lupanar fecit e mundo*.

² *Or.* 32 *de moderatione* (sic!) *in disputando*, PGM XXXVI 201 C.

³ *Ep.* 190, PGM XXXVII p. 311.

⁴ *Poem. mor.* X 306, PGM XXXVII p. 702.

ὁ μὲν καπήλου δυστυχῶς ἔζη βίον
 πόνους διατελῶν κέρδεσιν θαλαττίους·
 ἔλαιον ἦν ὁ φόρτος· οὕτω τοῦτ' ἴσως
 ἔρεις ἀπληστον καὶ πενία τι προσνέμεις.
 τὸ δὲ τραπέζας προσκυνεῖν τυραννικάς
 Πλάτωνα, φεῦ, λόγων τε καὶ σεμνῶν πόνων.
 ἔῷ λέγειν πρᾶσιν τε καὶ οὐχὶ πρᾶσιν,
 εἰ μὴ Πλάτωνί τις Λιβύς¹ τῆς Ἑλλάδος
 ᾤφθη γ' ἀμείνων, καὶ μικροῦ τιμήματος
 δόξαν τε καὶ Πλάτωνος ὠνεῖται λόγους.

Many well-known topics recur in his assaults on Plato, *τυραννίδας μονοноῦ προσκυνοῦσι*,² *paederasty*³, *Πλάτωνος λιχνείας τῆς Σικελικῆς*⁴, *τὴν ἐν Ποτιδαίᾳ στάσιν*,⁵ *κοινογαμία*,⁶ etc.

The fanatic Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria 412—444, who among other things probably has to answer for the murder of Hypatia, loves to speak of the ἀπάτη Ἑλληνική, and in his work *Contra Julianum* he quotes long passages from Porphyry. Moses was a great man, he says⁷, *ὁποῖος γε μὴν ὁ Πλάτων ἦν, καὶ εἰ μὴ τις λέγοι, διαβοήσειεν ἂν ἡ ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἐπὶ Σικελίαν ἄφοδος· σὺ γὰρ ἀρεσθέντα ταῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ θωπείαις τὸν Διόνυσιον ἀποδόσθαι φασὶν αὐτόν*, and further on, 818 D, *ἀλλ' ὁ δεινὸς παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ διαβόητος Πλάτων σὺ παιδοτριβαὶς ὠμυληκῶς⁸ καὶ παλαίστραις ἐν ἀρχαῖς ἐμφιλοχωρῶν ἐξ ἰδρώτων ἀθλητικῶν μεταπεφοίτηκεν ὥς φιλοσοφίαν*; That the substance of this passage has come from Aristoxenus is proved by the quotation from the *Φιλόσοφος Ἱστορία* shortly afterwards.

The quotations from the writings of Cyril, displaying his harsh anti-platonic bias, could easily be multiplied, but the same tedious

¹ Anniceris is said to have ransomed Plato for 20 minae from Dionysius of Syracusae, Diog. Laert. II 86, probably of Aristoxenean origin.

² *Contra Julian.* I 44, PGM XXXV 568 B.

³ *ib.* 596 A, for more evidence see J. M. Gesner, *Socrates Sanctus Paederasta*, Göttingen 1752.

⁴ *ib.* 596 B.

⁵ *ib.* 596 B.

⁶ *Or. in laudem Heronis philosophi*, PGM XXXV 1298 B.

⁷ PGM LXXXVI 576 D.

⁸ This is the moralizing trend of Aristoxenus, the stern Pythagorean.

monotony marks the work throughout. Luzac has exposed at length how the story of the bigamy of Socrates was utilized by Cyril and Theodoretus.

John Chrysostom (334—397) shows perhaps in his little pamphlet *Περὶ κενοδοξίας* and elsewhere that he is to some degree really influenced by Plato, but in point of fact he is, apart from Tatianus, the most hateful enemy of ancient philosophy among the Holy Fathers. Plato and Pythagoras, he says¹, are the only ones of the philosophers who are worth mentioning, ἀλλ' ὁμως δὲ ἐν ἅπασιν παιδῶν αἰσχροτέρον κατεγελάσθησαν, τὰς τε γὰρ γυναῖκας κοινὰς ἅπασιν ποιοῦντες (thus poor Pythagoras is included in the verdict), καὶ τὸν βίον αὐτὸν ἀναπρέποντες, καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν διαφθείροντες τοῦ γάμου, καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα νομοθετοῦντες, οὕτω πάντα τὸν βίον αὐτῶν ἀνάλωσαν. δογμάτων δ' ἕνεκεν τῶν περὶ ψυχῆς οὐδὲ ὑπερβολὴν τινα κατέλιπον αἰσχύνῃς λοιπὸν, μυίας καὶ κώνωπας καὶ θάμνους τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγοντες γίνεσθαι ψυχὰς κτλ., but ἐξ ὅτου γὰρ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἄλιεῖς,² ἐξ ἐκείνου τὰ μὲν Πυθαγόρου σεσίγηται καὶ τὰ Πλάτωνος, καὶ οὐδ' ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτοὺς ἴσασιν οἱ πολλοί. Everywhere he attacks Plato who according to him was ζηλοτύπως πρὸς ἅπαντας διακείμενος. In another sermon he exclaims³: Ποῦ νῦν Πλάτων, ποῦ Πυθαγόρας, ποῦ τῶν Στωικῶν ὁ ὄρμαθός; καὶ γὰρ πολλῆς ἀπολαύσας ἐκεῖνος τιμῆς οὕτως ἡλέγγετο, ὥς καὶ ἀπεμποληθῆναι καὶ μηδὲν ὦν ἐβόλετο καθορθῶσαι οὐδὲ ἐφ' ἐνός τυράννου· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς προδοὺς ἐλεεινῶς τὸν βίον κατέλυσε. Plato is of course accused of paederasty and — and this probably marks the very climax of the anti-platonic tradition — καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀπογεύεσθαι ἔλεγεν ἀδιάφορον εἶναι.⁴ An example of the unscrupulousness with which old familiar stories are embroidered, is afforded by the following version of the story of Xanthippa, also related by Diogenes Laertius II 37 and Plutarch *de inimic. util.* c. 8, 90 E: λέγεται γοῦν τις καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν φιλοσόφων μοχθηρὰν ἔχων γυναῖκα καὶ φλύαρον καὶ πάροινον πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτῶντας, τίνος ἕνεκεν τοιαύτην ἔχειν ἀνέχεται, εἰπεῖν, ὥστε γυμνάσιον καὶ

¹ *Hom. in Joh.* II 2, PGM LIX 30.

² Cfr ἀλιεντικῶς ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀριστοτελικῶς, *Greg. Naz. or. de pace* III, PGM XXXV 1164 C.

³ *Hom. in Matth.* XXXIII 4, PGM LVII p. 392.

⁴ *De S. Babyla contra Julianum et gentiles* 9, PGM L p. 546. Also Aristotle and Zenon are coarsely calumniated.

παλαιστραν ἔχειν φιλοσοφίας¹ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας. Of course the Platonic *Republic* is ridiculed, Πλάτων δὲ τὴν καταγέλαστον ἐκείνην πολιτείαν συνθείς.²

The anti-platonic bias of the Christian Fathers is a gloomy chapter in the history of human thought. It shows us how factiousness and prejudice obscures the eye and makes anything in the nature of true appreciation quite impossible. These Fathers were certainly not so ignorant of Greek philosophy as it may seem, nor were they liars, merely fanatical partisans. I am convinced that at the moment when from the pulpit they pronounced their verdicts on the Greek philosophers and told their auditors of the gluttony and lechery of Plato, they actually believed in what they were saying. They had definitely and deliberately shut their ears and eyes to anything that might aid them in understanding the ancient thinkers in order the better to fight the fight for the true faith.

The fourth great calumniator of this period is Theodoretus, the contemporary antagonist of Cyril, perhaps a little more modest in his censure of the old philosophers than the others mentioned above. A single example of his turgid rhetoric from *Sermo II de principio* will be sufficient: τί γὰρ Ὀμήρου ποιήσεως ἥδιον; τί δὲ τῆς εὐεπείας ἐκείνης γλυκύτερον; ἀλλ' ὅμως τοῦτον φιλοσόφων ὁ ἄριστος — ἐπέγνωτε δὲ δήπου τὸν Ἀρίστωνος ὡς ἡγοῦμαι — μύρω γε ἀλείψας (cfr Rep. 398 A) καθάπερ αἱ γυναῖκες τὰς χελιδόνας ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ξυντεθείσης ἀπέπεμψε πόλεως, ἀκολασίας καλέσας καὶ δυσσεβείας διδάσκαλον. βλασφημεῖν γὰρ φησιν ἐκπαιδεύει τοὺς νέους καὶ πονηρὰς αὐτοῖς περὶ τῶν θεῶν ἐκτίθῃσι δόξας καὶ ἀπαλοῖς ἔτι οὔσι μαθήματα πονηρὰ καὶ διεφθαρμένα ἐνίησι.³

The work of Theodoretus entitled Ἑλληνικῶν θεραπευτικῶν παθημάτων ἢ εὐαγγελικῆς ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐπίγνωσις is, as the title already indicates, a long-winded and tiresome compilation of Clemens and Eusebius, which writers, however, he carefully avoids mentioning as his sources. A pamphlet *Katὰ Πλάτωνος περὶ θεοῦ*

¹ These words probably come from Aristoxenus through Porphyry. The passage is much longer with rich novelistic colours, see *Hom. in ep. I ad Cor.* XXVI, PGM LXI p. 224. In *Adv. apparat. vitae monast.* II 5, PGM XLVII p. 339, there is a series of stories about the Academy and a lively novel about Socrates and Archelaus.

² *Hom. in Matth.* I 4, PGM LVII p. 18.

³ Similarly Greg. Naz. *or.* 25 in laudem Heronis philos., PGM XXXV 1205 A.

καὶ θεῶν by Diodorus of Tarsus (dead 394) may be mentioned here; it is not preserved as far as I know.

Side by side with the anti-platonic and anti-philosophic tradition, the opposite current continues to flow, biding its time. A delightful short speech, addressed to youth, on the benefit of Greek literature by Basil (330—379) has come down to us. It is entitled *Λόγος πρὸς τοὺς νέους ὅπως ἂν ἐξ Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῖντο λόγων*¹ and has a clearly platonizing character, although the inevitable anecdotal slander is not lacking; and of course the pious Synesius should not be left out.

One would have imagined that an author like Lucian would have played something of an important part as a source for anti-platonic polemics, but astonishingly enough such is not the case. Perhaps the frequent use of the *κοινογαμία* motif is the only thing that comes from him. Only one father betrays any knowledge of his writings, namely the abbot Isidorus of Pelusium, who was a contemporary of Cyril, whom he violently attacked. In one of his preserved letters he writes²: ἀνεκωμωδήθη (sc. Plato) παρὰ τῶν Κυνικῶν, ὧν εἰς ἣν καὶ Λουκιανὸς ὁ τοὺς διαλόγους κατὰ πάντων ὁμοῦ σχεδὸν τῶν τε εἰρημένων (schools of philosophy) τῶν τε παραλελειμμένων συντάξας, ὃν οἱ μὲν Πλατωνικοὶ διὰ τὸ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν ἀναπλασθέντας θεοὺς τεθεατρικέναι ἀπεδέξαντο, οἱ δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν τρόφιμοι δύσφημον ἀπεκάλησαν· δεινῶς γὰρ τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκθeliaζομένους θεοὺς ἐξεκωμώδησε.

There is one thing worth dwelling on in conclusion. I have already *Conclusion* stressed the fact that the strong anti-platonic tradition of the fourth century and the first half of the fifth, partly owed its rise to the material which Porphyry served up in his history of philosophy from the storehouse of Aristoxenus. Thus it is, indeed, strange to observe how this man, who must be regarded in some measure as the original founder of peripatetic biography, up to the last lays his hand on the tradition and imparts to it its special quality and flavour.

It is now also salutary to see how a man, who stood aside from the ecclesiastical dissensions of the time, judged the chief scourges of the anti-platonic tradition. The historian Socrates (380—450) in his ecclesiastical history records the following sound verdict³.

¹ PGM XXXI 371 B, compare 584 C. He also praises the power of music, μουσικῆς ἰσχύς.

² Ep. IV 55, PGM LXXVII 1106 C.

³ Hist. Eccles. III 23.

Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μαχόμενός τινι νῦν μὲν παρατρέπων, νῦν δ' ἐπικρύπτων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καταφεύδεται τοῦ πρὸς δὴν ἡ μάχη συνίσταται· καὶ ὁ ἀπεχθῶς ἔχων πρὸς τινα πάντα ὡς πολέμιος οὐ μόνον πράττειν ἀλλὰ καὶ λέγειν ἔσπουδακε καὶ τὰ αὐτῷ προσόντα φαῦλα, τῷ πρὸς δὴν ἡ ἔχθρα, περιτρέπειν φιλεῖ. ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς καὶ Πορφύριος, δὴν Τύριον καλεῖ γέροντα, ἄμφω φιλοσκῶπται ἦσαν, ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων λόγων ἐλέγχονται. Πορφύριος γὰρ τοῦ κορυφαιοτάτου τῶν φιλοσόφων Σωκράτους τὸν βίον διέσπειρεν ἐν τῇ γεγραμμένῃ αὐτῷ Φιλοσόφῳ Ἱστορίᾳ, καὶ τοιαῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ γράφας κατέλειπεν, οἷα ἂν μήτε Μέλιτος μήτε Ἄνυτος οἱ γραφάμενοι Σωκράτην εἰπεῖν ἐπεχείρησαν· Σωκράτους φημι τοῦ παρ' Ἑλλήσι θαυμάζομένου ἐπὶ τῇ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς, δὴν Πλάτων, ὁ θαυμαστός παρ' αὐτοῖς φιλόσοφος, καὶ Ξενοφῶν καὶ ὁ ἄλλος τῶν φιλοσόφων θίασος, οὐ μόνον ὡς θεοφιλῇ τιμῶσιν ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπὸν φρονεῖν νενομίκασιν.

I have reached the end of this short — and as some may say superficial — study of the anti-platonic tradition in the classical antiquity. I have to a great extent allowed the authors to characterize themselves, by freely quoting their writings, confining myself to giving an indication of the line of development and displaying what I believe to have been the preponderant motives and tendency in each case. I subjoin a word by Dio Chrysostom: *κἂν ὑμῖν ὁ καθαρόδός ἐκμελῶς ἄδη καὶ παρὰ τὸν τόνον, συνίετε.*

KUNGL. VITTERHETS HISTORIE OCH
ANTIKNITETS AKADEMIENS

HANDLINGAR

FEMTIOFÖRSTA DELEN



STOCKHOLM

I DISTRIBUTION HOS
WAHLSTRÖM & WIDSTRAND
STOCKHOLM

KUNGL. VITTERHETS HISTORIE OCH
ANTIKNITETS AKADEMIENS HANDLINGAR UTGIVAS MED ANSLAG
UR HUMANISTISKA FONDEN

GÖTEBORG 1941
ELANDERS BOKTRYCKERI AKTIEBOLAG

I N N E H Å L L

N:r 1. ERNST CASSIRER: Thorilds Stelling in der Geistesgeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.

N:r 2. INGEMAR DÜRING: Herodicus the Crateteian.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Under de senaste åren ha följande delhäften av Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar utkommit:

	Pris Kr.
Del 34, h. 1: BERNHARD SALIN: Minnesteckning över Oscar Montelius.	
Del 34, h. 2: GUNNAR EKHOLM: Bibliographia	5: —
Del 34, h. 2: ARTHUR STILLE: Saxos skånska stridsskildringar.	
BIRGER NERMAN: En utvandring från Gotland och öns införlivande med sveaväldet	5: —
Del 34, h. 3: BIRGER NERMAN: Die Herkunft und die frühesten Auswanderungen der Germanen	5: —
Del 34, h. 4: FRIEDRICH PLUTZAR: Die Ornamentik der Runensteine	5: —
Del 35: OSCAR ALMGREN: Hällristningar och kultbruk	15: —
Del 36, h. 1: SUNE LINDQVIST: Vendelkulturens ålder och ursprung	6: —
Del 36, h. 2: ELIAS WESSÉN: De nordiska folktammarna i Beowulf	3: —
Del 36, h. 3: JOHN NIHLÉN: Gotlands stenåldersboplatser	6: —
Del 37, h. 1: HARALD HANSSON: Gotlands bronsålder	8: —
Del 37, h. 2—5: Stenåldersboplatser i Östergötland I	4: —
Del 37, h. 6: T. ENGSTRÖM: Från stenålderns boplatsekultur vid Bråviken	2: —
Del 37, h. 7: AXEL BAGGE: Stenåldersboplatser vid Vivastemåla, Västrums socken, Småland	4: —
Del 38, h. 1: T. G. APPELGREN: Doktor Otto Smiths Münzensammlung.....	3: 50
Del 38, h. 2: CARL M. FÜRST: Birger Jarls grav i Varnhems klosterkyrka	2: —
Del 38, h. 3: ANDREAS OLDEBERG: Det nordiska bronsåldersspännets historia	7: 50
Del 39, h. 1: ERIK LUNDBERG: Topografiska stadsundersökningar i Söderköping ...	3: —
Del 39, h. 2: OTTO RYDBECK: Italienskt inflytande på skånsk kyrkobyggnadskonst	2: —
Del 39, h. 3: BENGT THORDEMAN: Några svensk-norska numismatiska problem i belysning av ett västsvenskt skattefynd	2: —
Del 39, h. 4: LIS JACOBSEN: Forbandelsesformularer i nordiske Runcinskripter ...	5: —
Del 39, h. 5: T. J. ARNE: Barsoff Gorodok. Ein westsibirisches Gräberfeld aus der jüngeren Eisenzeit.....	5: —
Del 40, h. 1: BIRGER NERMAN: Die Verbindungen zwischen Skandinavien und dem Ostbaltikum	5: —
Del 40, h. 2: RICHARD VASMER: Ein im Dorfe Staryi Dedin in Weissrussland gemachter Fund kufischer Münzen	2: —
Del 40, h. 3: W. J. RAUDONIKAS: Die Normannen der Wikingerzeit und das Ladogagebiet	10: —
Del 41, h. 1: VILHELM GÖDEL: Riksantikvarieämbetet	5: —
Del 41, h. 2: CARL HALLENDORFF: Konung Oscar I:s politik under Krimkriget ...	5: —
Del 42, h. 1: EILERT EKWALL: Studies on English Place-Names	6: —
Del 42, h. 2: O. KÄLLSTRÖM: Medeltida silverar från svenska och finska kyrkor...	2: —
Del 42, h. 3: ELISABETH SVÄRDSTRÖM: Johannes Bureus' arbeten om svenska runinskrifter	4: 50
Del 42, h. 4: NILS ÅBERG: Kulturmotsättningar i Danmarks stenålder	7: 50
Del 43: HOLGER ARBMAN: Schweden und das karolingische Reich	15: —
Del 44, h. 1—2: BENGT HILDEBRAND: C. J. Thomsen och hans lärda förbindelser i Sverige 1816—1837, Del I—II	8: —
Del 45, h. 1: ERIK TIDNER: Sprachlicher Kommentar zur lateinischen Didascalia apostolorum	8: —
Del 45, h. 2: NILS LITHBERG och ELIAS WESSÉN: Den gotländska runkalendern 1328	8: —
Del 46, h. 1: L. VON POST, A. OLDEBERG und I. FRÖMAN: Ein eisenzeitliches Rad aus dem Filaren-See in Södermanland.....	4: 50
Del 46, h. 2: KJELL KUMLIEN: Karl Knutsson i Preussen 1457—1464	4: —
Del 46, h. 3: OTTO V. FRIESEN: Sparlösa stenar	5: —
Del 46, h. 4: NILS ÅBERG: Keltiska och orientaliska stilinflytelser i vikingatidens nordiska konst	5: —
Del 47: WILHELM HOLMQVIST: Kunstprobleme der Merowingerzeit.....	15: —
Del 48: HENRIK SCHÜCK: Stockholm vid 1400-talets slut.....	8: —
Del 49: ERIK BOHRN: Nyköpings renässansslott och Herkules Mida	12: —
Del 50, h. 1: CARL JOHAN LAMM: Oriental Glass of Mediaeval Date Found in Sweden and the Early History of Lustre-Painting	7: —
Del 50, h. 2: BENGT SÖDERBERG: Sundholmen. Ett Braheslott från äldre Vasatid i Västergötland	5: —
Del 51, h. 1: ERNST CASSIRER: Thorilds Stellung in der Geistesgeschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts	5: —
Del 51, h. 2: INGEMAR DÜRING: Herodotus the Crateteian	7: —

Delarna 34—49 samt 51 äro därmed avslutade.

I DISTRIBUTION HOS
WAHLSTRÖM & WIDSTRAND
STOCKHOLM

Pris kr. 7:—